
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>



H
A5

THE
AMERICAN
=
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

HONORARY FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

VOL. XXXVIII

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

BALTIMORE: B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, AGENTS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTENOING LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1917

RS

123068

P1
. A5
N. 32



The Lord Baltimore Press
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

WILLIAM MARSHALL
WILLIAM MARSHALL

88
—
21
—
7

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXVIII.

No. 149.

I.—Some Cruces in Vedic Text, Grammar, and Interpretation. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD,	1
II.—Pompeius Trogus and Justinus. By R. B. STEELE,	19
III.—Paulus Silentarius. By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,	42
IV.—The Pronunciation of a Final Consonant when Followed by an Initial Consonant in a Latin Word-Group. By FRANK FROST ABBOTT,	73
V.—Sobriquet and Stem. By EDWIN W. FAY,	82
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	88
Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology.—Shaksperian Studies, edited by Matthews and Thorndike.—Cuq's <i>Une statistique de locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale.</i> —Stampini's <i>Il codice Bresciano di Catullo.</i>	
REPORTS:	100
<i>Revue de Philologie</i> .— <i>Rheinisches Museum.</i>	
BRIEF MENTION,	110
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	119
BOOKS RECEIVED,	122

No. 150.

I.—Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches. Part I. By H. V. CANTER,	125
II.—The Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in Greek Law. Part I. By WALTER WOODBURN HYDE,	152
III.—Religious Burlesque in Aristophanes and Elsewhere. By JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT,	176
IV.—On the Disposition of Spoil in the Homeric Poems. By A. T. MURRAY,	186
V.— <i>Molle Atque Facetum.</i> By CHARLES KNAPP,	194
VI.—On the Semantics of <i>-ΘEN</i> . By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,	200

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	201
Winter, The Prodromus of Nicolaus Steno's Dissertation Concerning a Solid Body Enclosed by a Process of Nature Within a Solid.—Marchesi, Apulei Platonici Madaurensis de Magia Liber.—Butler and Owen, Apulei Apologia.—Housman, M. Manilius Astronomicon, Liber Tertius, Recensuit et Enarravit.—Ernout, Recueil de Textes Latins Archaiques.—Fowler, Virgil's "Gathering of the Clans".—Walters, A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Mythology.	
REPORTS:	213
Hermes.—Rivista di Filologia.	
BRIEF MENTION,	222
CORRESPONDENCE,	228
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	233
BOOKS RECEIVED,	235
No. 151.	
I.—The Plot of the Epidicus. By ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER,	237
II.—Apophony and Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomatopoeias. By ALBERT J. CARNOY,	265
III.—The Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in Greek Law. Part II. By WALTER WOODBURN HYDE,	285
IV.—Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum. Part I. By W. SHERWOOD FOX,	304
V.—Petrarch and the Wine of Meroe. By ALBERT S. COOK,	312
VI.—Aryan <i>pitar</i> - and Dravidian * <i>pitar</i> - . By EDWIN H. TUTTLE,	315
REVIWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	317
Cocchia's Romanzo e realtà nella vita e nell' attività letteraria di Lucio Apuleio.—Vespucci Reprints, Texts and Studies.—Byrne's Prolegomena to an Edition of the Works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius.—Bouchier's Syria as a Roman Province.—Ernout's Lucrèce, <i>De la Nature</i> , livre quatrième.—Cooper's A Concordance to the Works of Horace.—Preston's Studies in the Diction of the <i>Sermo Amatorius</i> in Roman Comedy.	
REPORTS:	329
Revue de Philologie.—Rivista di Filologia.	
BRIEF MENTION,	333
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	343
BOOKS RECEIVED,	347

CONTENTS.

v

NO. 152.

I.—The St. Gall Glossary. By W. M. LINDSAY,	349
II.—Vediovis, The Volcanic God. A Reconstruction. By A. L. FROTHINGHAM,	370
III.—An Oxford Scholar. By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,	392
IV.—Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum. By W. SHERWOOD FOX,	411
V.—Reduplication in Tagalog. By FRANK R. BLAKE,	425
VI.—Slavic <i>togo</i> . By E. PROKOSCH,	432
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	435
Quackenbos, The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra.—Wells, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1400.—Dottin, Les Anciens Peuples de l'Europe.—The Arden Shakespeare.—Gummere, Seneca: ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales.	
REPORTS:	447
Hermes.—Rivista di Filologia.	
BRIEF MENTION,	454
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	463
BOOKS RECEIVED,	465
INDEX,	467

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, I.

WHOLE NO. 149.

I.—SOME CRUCES IN VEDIC TEXT, GRAMMAR, AND INTERPRETATION.

1. *ajuryamur* for *ajur(yám)* *yamur*, and other haplogies.

RV. 5. 6. 10 we have the notorious passage containing the complex of syllables, *ajuryamur*, which the *Padakāra* fails to analyze, to wit :

evāñ agním ajuryamur gírbhír yajñébhir ānuśák,
dádhad asmé suvíryam utá tyád ācváçvyam.

For previous discussions of *ajuryamur* by Ludwig, Pischel, Bartholomae, and Oldenberg, see the last-mentioned scholar's *Rig-Veda Noten*, First Part, p. 315 ff. My own way is indicated by the heading.

If we regard *ajuryamur* as haplological contraction for *ajur(yám)* *yamur*, the first distich is to be rendered : 'Thus they have gotten hold of imperishable Agni by means of songs and sacrifices, properly'. Agni, like other gods, is imperishable, *ajuryá*, RV. 1. 146. 4; 2. 8. 2; 10. 88. 13; *ajára* 1. 58. 4; 127. 9; 6. 29, etc. For 'holding', 'keeping hold' of Agni see 3. 27. 3, *ágne çakéma te vayám yámarin devásya vajinah*; or 2. 5. 1, *çakéma vajino yámam*.

Another case of haplogy as between two individual words, namely *tavásam* *rabhasva* for *tavásam(sám)* *rabhasva* occurs in AV. II. I. 14 :

émā agur yośitāh cúmbhamānā út tiṣṭha nāri tavásam
rabhasva,
supátni pátyā prajáyā prajávaty á tvāgan yajñáḥ práti
kumbháni gṛbháya.

A glance at the lists under root *rabh* in Grassmann's and Whitney's Indexes to RV. and AV. shows that the simple root without prepositional prefixes scarcely occurs in either text. Whitney, indeed, lists the simple root only in that very passage, AV. II. I. 14. In a note on p. 614 of my translation of the hymn, SBE. xlii, I stated that *Sāyaṇa* reads in *pāda* b, *tava samṛabhasva*, and the *Pāippalāda*, *tavaḥ samṛabhasva*. I remarked, furthermore, that the original reading may have been, *tavásam* (*sámī*)*rabhasva*. Of this suggestion the Whitney-Lanman translation takes no note. Yet it furnishes the key to the passage: 'The maidens (the waters), ornamenting themselves, have come hither. Arise thou, woman, take hold of (*sámī* *rabhasva*) the strong one (*tavásam*, i. e., the pitcher, *kumbhám*, masculine) !'

Once more in a Vedic text, simple *rabh*, without preposition calls for correction. In MÇ. 3. 5. 13 we have the corrupt stanza, as edited by Knauer:

agnir bhagah savitedam juṣantām prajāpatir varuno . . .
ya . . . mahyam,
yo no dveṣṭi tanūm rabhasvānāgaso yajamānasya vīrān.

There are two parallels to this corrupt stanza. AV. 9. 5. 2:

īndrāya bhāgām pári tvā nayāmy asmīn yajñē yájamānāya
sūrim,
yé no dviṣānty ánu tān rabhasvānāgaso yájamānasya vīrāh.

And ApÇ. 7. 17. 2:

indrasya bhāgah suvite dadhātanemam yajñām yajamānam
ca sūrāu,
yo no dveṣṭy anu tam ravasvānāgaso yajamānasya vīrāh.

Whitney, in his translation of AV., does not mention the parallels; Knauer, at MÇ., is cognizant of AV. 9. 5. 2, but not of ApÇ. The intricacies of these correspondences need not concern us at present. I would remark, however, that Knauer's MSS. read at the beginning *agner bhāgah*, which corresponds to the parallels, and is probably to be retained in the text. The point that concerns us here is that the third *pāda* of MÇ. is to be read *yo no dveṣṭy tam anu rabhasva*. In ApÇ. *ravasva* is secondary, tho perhaps intentional; see the author, AJPh. XXVII. 413.

I note in this connection some cases of haplogy in chance compounds. In RV. 1. 48. 2 the compound *viçvasuvid*, by the side of *áçvāvant* and *gómant*, rendered by 'knowing all well', makes no sense in that connection (*Uṣas*). The word is *viç(va)-vasuvid* 'getting all goods'; see *Uṣas*'s epithet *ābhārād-vasu*, 'bringing on goods', 5. 79. 2; and cf. the word *vasutvanám* in the related stanza, 7. 81. 6, or the expression *utóṣo vásva içiṣe* in 4. 52. 3. In *Ulūka-Jātaka* (270) *appatissavāsa*, 'living in anarchy', is for *a-ppatissa(va)vāsa*; and in *Dadhivāhana-Jātaka* (186) *maṇḍukāṇṭaka*, designation of a plant is probably for *maṇḍu(ka)-kaṇṭaka* 'frog-thorn'. In *Māhārāṣṭri Prākrit*, *avaratta* is for *ava(ra)ratta* = Skt. *aparārātra*, 'second part of the night'; see Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen*, p. 32, l. 37. On the literature of haplogy (or haplolaly)¹, which has of recent years grown apace, see last Collitz, *Das schwache Präteritum* (Göttingen, 1912), p. 237 ff. I would draw attention particularly to instances of the phenomenon as between two successive words: Bloomfield, *American Journal of Philology*, xvii. 418; Schwyzer, *IF*. xiv. 24 ff; xxviii. 300; and Wackernagel, *KZ*. xl. 546.

2. *chardís* for *chadís*, a case of contamination or word blend.

The two words in the caption are obviously related. The metre of the *Veda* points to *chadís* instead of *chardís* in all critical positions: RV. 1. 48. 15; 8. 9. 1; 18. 21; 27. 4; 67. 6; 71. 14. Grassmann (as after him others) outlines the problem very neatly in his *Lexicon*, s. v.: 'chardís, wofür wahrscheinlich überall chadís zu lesen ist, da sämmtliche metrisch entscheidenden Stellen die Kürze der ersten Silbe fordern und keine deren Länge begünstigt. Das r scheint in die spätere Redaction durch Missverständniss hineingedrungen'. For other discussions see Oldenberg, *ZDMG*. lv. 312, and the literature there cited.

What now is the nature of this 'misunderstanding', and is it really such? Grassmann's statement is very well as soon as we substitute for misunderstanding the linguistic term 'contamination', or 'blend'. The poets of the *RV*. knew only

¹In sense haplolaly is preferable to haplogy, but the former word with its three l's ironically invites the very change which it aims to describe, as, indeed, also does haplogy with its two *lo's*.

the word chadis, 'cover'. Like other words of this semantic class the word meant both 'cover' (in the physical sense), and 'protection'; cf., e. g., várma, 'armor', and, 'protection'. In the more concrete sense of 'cover' chadis occurs in RV. 10. 85. 10; AV. 3. 7. 3, and it endures down to Kathásaritságara 2. 49. In the abstract sense of 'protection' the word blended with, or was contaminated by, cárma 'protection', taking its r from that word. Again in that form the word endures clear thru to Māhārāṣṭrī Prākrit chaddī (Jacobi, Erzählungen, p. 76, l. 32). The contamination obviously took place in the time that passed between RV. composition and RV. redaction. At the time of the redaction the word for 'protection' had so definitely assumed the form chardis that the diaskeuasts of the RV. had to substitute it for the poets' chadis, metre *contradicente*. The old word chadis had completely sloughed that meaning.

That all this is indeed so, is rendered probable by the intimate and persistent synonymy of cárma and chardis. Thus the line RV. 7. 52. 2^b, cárma tokāya tánayāya gopāḥ, is echoed in the formula, chardis tokāya tanayāya yacha, TB. i. 1. 7. 1; ApG. 5. 12. 1. In RV. 1. 114. 5^d both words occur together, cárma várma chardirasmábhyām yañsat. Almost every qualifying expression that is used with cárma is also used with chardis. Thus trivárūtha, 'offering threefold safety', or varūthyā, 'offering safety'; or várutha by the side of each:

cárma no yañsan trivárūtham, 10. 66. 5
 savitā cárma yachatv asmē trivárūtham, 4. 53. 6
 sá nah cárma trivárūtham ví yañsat, 8. 42. 3
 cármañā nas trivárūthena pāhi, 5. 4. 8
 trivárūtham maruto yanta naç chardih, 8. 18. 21.

Cf. also MS. 2. 8. 7^d: 111. 4; KS. 17. 6; TA. 2. 5. 2.

cárma . . . varūthyām tād asmāsu ví yantana, 8. 47. 10
 břhaspátiḥ cárma . . . no yamad varūthyām, 5. 46. 5
 chardir yád vām varūthyām, 6. 67. 2
 bhávā várūtham . . . maghávadbhyāḥ cárma, 1. 58. 9
 cárma no yantam ámavad várūtham, 4. 55. 4
 áchidram cárma yachata . . . várūtham, 8. 27. 0
 yád vah . . . várūtham ásti yác chardih, 8. 67. 9.

Or, again, adjectives for 'broad' go with both nouns: *urú, pṛthú*, and especially *sapráthah*:

yáchā nah cárma sapráthah, 1. 22. 15

sapráthah cárma yacha sahantya, 6. 16. 33

chardír yacha vitáhavyāya sapráthah, 6. 15. 3

sapráthah chardír yantam ádābhyma, 8. 5. 12

urv àsmā áditih cárma yañsat, 4. 25. 5

prá no yachatād avṛkám pṛthú chardíh, 1. 48. 15

prásmāi yachatam avṛkám pṛthú chardíh, 8. 9. 1.

As regards other adjectives, or other related connections, the following pairs or groups speak for themselves:

durādhárṣāin grnáte cárma yañsat, 6. 49. 7

ádhṛṣṭāin chardír yád vām, 6. 67. 2

bhávā . . . maghavan maghávadbhyāḥ cárma, 1. 58. 9

chardír yacha maghávadbhyāṣ ca mahyam ca, 6. 46. 9

(cf. 7. 74. 5; 8. 5. 12)

cárma tokāya tánayāya gopāḥ, 7. 52. 2 (cf. TB. 1. 1. 7. 1)

ádhā smā yacha tanvē tāne ca chardíh, 6. 42. 12.

On the character and frequency of lexical contaminations see the author, Am. Journ. of Philol. xii. 1 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; Indo-germanische Forschungen, iv. 66 ff.; and most recently Guntert, Ueber Reimwortbildung im Arischen und Altgriechischen (Heidelberg, 1914).

3. Some Σχῆματα.

The two stanzas, RV. 1. 4 5, 6 read:

utá bruvantu no níðo nír anyatáç cid árata,
dádhānā índra id dúvah.

utá nah subhágāi arír vocéyur dasma krṣṭayah,
syáméd índrasya cármaṇi.

The renderings mark a to and fro from a correct understanding: Bollensen, Orient und Occident, ii. 462; Ludwig, 443; Grassmann, ii. 5; Pischel, ZDMG. xl. 125; Geldner, Ved. Stud. iii. 79; Oldenberg, Rig-Veda Noten i. 4. Geldner comes nearest to the correct sense; I would translate:

'Whether our enemies happen to say (about us): "when ye pay respect to Indra alone (id), ye have shut yourself off

from other (benefits)"; or, if both gentle and common folk should, O wise (God Indra), pronounce us lucky, (in either case) shall we under Indra's protection be.'¹

utá-utá are clearly antithetic. The two stanzas seem to express an almost sectarian difference between Indra worshipers and people who despise Indra (anindrá), but worship other gods. Intentionally I render ariḥ . . . krṣṭayah by 'both gentle and common folk', i. e., 'rich and poor', or 'patricians and plebeians'. Ariḥ has been suspected (Bollensen suggests ariḥ). But it is correct and idiomatic; we may call it participative singular. Johannes Schmidt, *Die Pluralbildung der Indo-germanischen Neutra*, pp. 314 ff., following Roth's suggestion in Pet. Lex., s. v. rathatúr, has shown that an inclusive plural noun with a plural verb is occasionally in Sanskrit and Greek accompanied by a singular noun which expresses part of the plural noun.² In our passage krṣṭayah includes both plebs (viçve, *οἱ πολλοί*) and patricians (ari); hence the participative singular ariḥ, by the side of and partly defining krṣṭayah with the plural verb. Cf. for this idiom also Ernst Fraenkel, *Indo-germanische Forschungen*, xxviii. 245 ff. For krṣṭi, ari, and viçva see Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* iii. 77 ff.

I am conceiving the matters involved here rather more precisely than does Geldner. krṣṭi(carsanī), 'people' is the totality which includes ari and viçva, 'noble and common', its two natural subdivisions; see 7. 48. 3; 8. 1. 22; 51. 9; 65. 9; 10. 28. 1. In Geldner's rendering (p. 78) of viçvágūrto ariṣṭutáḥ in 8. 1. 22, 'der von allen Gerühmte, (sogar) von den Reichen Ge-priesene', the word 'sogar' is needless. The expression means, 'he who is praised by plebs and "swell" alike'. Behind these two words stands the comprehensive krṣṭayah 'all folks'.

Another idiom, familiar in the Indo-European languages, ensures a similar effect, namely to mark the contrast between ari and viçva: RV. 10. 28. 1, viçvo hy ànyó arír äjagáma máméd áha çváçuro ná jagáma. Geldner, p. 78, translates, 'Jeder andere, (sogar) der Reiche ist erschienen; nur mein Schwiegervater ist nicht erschienen'. This neither does jus-

¹ The last pāda is repeated secondarily in 8. 47. 5c.

² In Greek rhetoric this idiom is defined as *σχῆμα καθ' δλον καὶ μέρος*; Kühner, *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, *Satzlehre* (Kühner-Gerth) vol. i, p. 289.

tice to the established contrast between *viçva* and *ari*, nor to the idiom involved in *anyá*. Translate: 'The common folk and (the others, sc.) the nobles have come, etc.'¹ This is the well-known anticipatory-appositional use of *anya*, common in Sanskrit, the exact replica of a familiar Greek idiom with *ἄλλο-*, e. g., Xen. Anab. I. 5. 5, οὐ γὰρ ἦν χόρτος οὐδὲ ἄλλο δένδρον. See Kühner, *Satzlehre*^a, vol. i, p. 275, note 1; the author, Amer. Journ. of Philology, vii. 101; Pet. Lex. vol. i, p. 262^b, where examples from Classical Sanskrit are cited abundantly but no Vedic cases. Another such case is contained in RV. I. 109. 6 where the word *anyá* in *viçvā bhúvanā . . . anyá* contrasts *viçvā bhúvanā*, 'all creatures', with a list of things that are not creatures. I suspect that other cases may turn up in the Veda.²

This idiom is familiar in modern French, in connection with plural pronouns; e. g., *nous autres Français*; *nous autres femmes*. It is also known in Spanish and other Romance tongues. Kühner-Gerth, I. c., also quotes the idiom, less familiarly, from Latin and Modern High German (Luther and Goethe); cf. also Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, ii, § 119, note 17. Altogether the idiom is found in Vedic and in Sanskrit; in Greek; in classical and in Late Latin; in Spanish, Provençal, and French; in Middle and Modern High German. See in general Böckh, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften* (1877), p. 105; Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romaines*, vol. ii, § 75; iii, § 209; Diez, iii, p. 84; Tobler, *Vermischtte Beiträge*, iii¹, p. 72; Hanssen, *Spanische Grammatik* § 56. 2; Gessner, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, xix. 155; Appel's *Old-Provençal Chrestomathie*, St. 16, vv. 29-32.

¹ More fully: 'Both plebs and patricians have come; my father-in-law alone has not come.'

² The use of *viçvah*, singular, as a collective in the sense of 'plebs', approximates the word to the plural *viçve*, in the same sense. This perhaps accounts for the seemingly senseless substitution in TS. I. 2. 2. 1, of the plural *viçve* for the singular *viçvah* with a singular verb (as in the other versions): *viçve devásya netúr márto vṛñita sakhyám*, 'the plebs, the mortal shall choose the companionship of the god that leadeth'. See last Keith, *Veda of the Black Yajus*, HOS. vol. xviii, p. 21.

4. On the expression *návyam sányase*.

The expression *návyam sányase* occurs, as far as I know, three times in the RV.¹ and once in the *Mahānāmī*-verses of the SV. and *Āitareya-āranyaka*, which makes it easy to take account.

The Pet. Lexs. and Grassmann in his Lexicon translate *sányas* by 'old', 'older', without indicating in any way how the word is to be rendered in its connection. Geldner in his Glossary renders the entire expression *návyam sányase* by 'was dem ältesten neu ist, d. h. etwas ganz neues, noch nie dagewesenes'. Keith, in his Translation of *Āitareya-āranyaka*, p. 263, suggests for *návyam* the meaning 'praiseworthy' (from root *nu*). As regards translations it will be well to review the proposals for each passage. RV. 3. 31. 19 reads:

tám aṅgiraván námasā saparyán
návyam kr̄nomi sányase purājám.

Grassmann, vol. 1, p. 530: 'Mit Anbetung ihn nach Aṅgiras-art verehrend, mach ich das alterzeugte [Lied] neu dem alten (sc. god Indra)'. Ludwig, 498: 'wie Aṅgiras mit Anbetung ihm dienend, mach ich ihn neu zum gewinnen, den ehvordem entstanden'. Ludwig does not comment upon his rendering: obviously he regards *sányase* as an infinitive of root *sa-* 'obtain'. Oldenberg, Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1915, p. 381: 'ich mache durch meine Anbetung den alten Gott neu (návyam) für alte Tat (damit du diese auch jetzt wieder tun mögest)'. It is easy to show that Grassmann was pretty close to the truth, tho he did not quite get it, and lapsed, as we shall see, in the two other RV. passages: *návyam kr̄nomi sányase purājám* contains, to my mind, a playful paradox: 'I make a new song (bráhma) that is (in reality) primordial (purājám) for the good old (*sányase*) god'.

The passages which show this to be true are of an almost mathematical insistence. RV. 1. 62. 13: *sanāyaté gótama indra návyam átakṣad bráhma hariyójanāya*, 'Gotama has fashioned for thee, O Indra, the old god, a new song, in order that thou mayest hitch thy bay steeds'. This paraphrases *sányase* by

sanāyaté, and fixes upon návyam the noun bráhma, and from this, as will appear, there is not a hair's breadth of deviation. See next 10. 91. 13, imárn pratnáya suṣṭutírn náviyasírn vóceyam asmā ucaté, 'let me pronounce for the god of yore, that is willing, this quite new song'. Here pratnáya suṣṭutírn náviyasírn=návyam (bráhma) sányase. Next, 6. 62. 5, tā valgú dasrá puruṣákatamā pratná návyasā vácasā viváse, 'these two lovely, most powerful Dasras (Açvins) of old I invite with a quite new song'. Here pratná návyasā vácasā=návyam (bráhma) sányase. RV. 6. 22. 7: tám (sc. índram) vo dhiyá návyasyā cāviṣṭham pratnám pratnavát paritañsaya-dhyái, 'deck out that mighty (Indra) of old with a new hymn as of old'. Here dhiyá návyasyā prátnam = návyam (bráhma) sányase. In 1. 61. 2 the antithesis between the 'new song' and the 'old god' is implied almost as clearly as tho it were directly expressed: asmái . . . índrāya . . . pratnáya pátye dhíyo marjayanta, 'let them polish up their songs for Indra the lord of old'. The word marjayanta 'polish up' here well takes the place of 'new'. The word prátna is a favorite in such connection, as may be seen in such passages as 6. 39. 5; 10. 4. 1.

In a slightly more remote way the antithesis between the 'new song' and the 'old god' is in the mind of the author of 2. 17. 1: tásd asmái návyam aṅgirásvád arcata cùṣmā yád asya pratnáthodírate, 'this new (bráhma) sing ye for him (Indra) in the fashion of the Aṅgiras in order that his fire shall be aroused as of old' (note aṅgirásvád, implying the past, as well as pratnáthā). Here návyam (bráhma) pratnáthā aṅgirásvát = návyam (bráhma) sányase. Yet more round about, 8. 95. 5: índra yás te náviyasírn gíraí mandrám ájijanat . . . dhíyam pratnám. And 9. 9. 8: nú návyase náviyase sūktáya sádhayā patháḥ, pratnavád rocayá rúcaḥ.

It is clear now that the expression návyam (bráhma) sán-yase (deváya) is elliptic. The reason why we Westerners are slow to understand such an expression is, that the Vedic Hindus understood it too well. The underlying idea, as the passages just cited show, must have become immensely familiar, before they could express it by simply saying 'a new for an old'. The same almost kenning-like familiarity of the expression guarantees beforehand that it could not have been

used in any other sense than just that. With this reasoning the facts chime in perfectly. RV. 8. 67. 18 reads :

tát sú no návyam sányasa ādityā yán mūmocati,
bandhád baddhám ivādite.¹

Grassmann, who came nearest to understanding 3. 31. 19, lapses from grace utterly: 'Zum alten fügt dies neue ihr, Aditya's, was, O Aditi, uns löst wie Sklaven von dem Strick'. Ludwig, 126: 'disz neue sei uns zum gewinne, was erlöset, o Āditya, wie aus fesseln den gebundenen, o Aditi'. Bergaigne, iii. 161, omitting apparently sányase: 'voici notre nouvel (hymne) qui doit nous délivrer, ô Adityas, comme un homme lié de son lieu, ô Aditi'. Oldenberg, l. c.: 'diese neue Tat (wird) uns (zuteil) zum Zweck des alten—d. h. damit die alte Tat fortwirke, sich erneuere.' Translate: 'This, pray, is our new (song) for a right old (god), which, O Ādityas, shall free us as a captive from his chain, O Aditi'.

The third occurrence of this cliché is in RV. 8. 24. 26:

tám u tvā nūnám īmahe návyam dańiśṭha sányase,
sá tvām no víçvā abhimātiḥ sakṣāṇih.

Grassmann: 'Darum begehrn wir von dir zum alten neues, herrlicher, sei du Vertilger aller Widersacher uns'. Ludwig, 597, 'als solchen flehen wir dich jetzt an, den frischen, wundertätigster, zu gewinne, als solcher bist du es, der uns alle nachstellungen überwindet'. Oldenberg, l. c.: 'wir gehen dich den Neuen (d. h. erneut sich Betätigenden) an für die alte Tat (damit du diese auch jetzt wieder tun mögest)'. In this stanza the construction of īmahe with two accusatives, rather than with accusative and instrumental is unusual: 'We pray to thee now, O most wise (Indra), a new (song) for a right old god: thou art the conqueror of all that plot against us'. Cf. pratnābhir ūtibhis by the side of īmahe in 8. 12. 24; or yajñēṣu pūrvyám by the side of īmahe in 8. 60. 2. Perhaps pāda b is to be taken parenthetically: 'We implore thee now—a new song for a right old god'—etc. There is, in any case, not the faintest reason for taking návyam sányase in a different sense.

¹ The stanza is paralleled interestingly in 8. 18. 12: tát sú nah čárma yachatādityā yán mūmocati, énasvantam cid énasah sudānavah.

The formula crops out once more in a passage of the *Māhānāmī* litany:

nūnām tān nāvyari sānyase
prābho jānasya vṛtrahan.¹

Oldenberg, l. c., '(ist) diese (Tat) nunmehr neu für die alte' (d. h. zum Zwecke der Erneuerung der alten). Or, '(rufen wir) diesen neuen jetzt (an) für die alte Tat' (d. h. damit er seine alte Tat wiederhole). Translate: '(We sing) now this new (song) in honor of the right old (god), O thou that art distinguished among the people, O slayer of Vṛtra'! That the poets diligently describe Indra as 'the god of yore' follows from the preceding passages, and can be easily corroborated by further evidence which is in everybody's hands.

**5. On stanza 6 in the hymn of Saramā and the Panis,
RV. 10. 108.**

Both the meaning of some of the words and a certain uncouth quality of the construction, which obviously states para-tactically what, to our feeling, should be stated hypotactically, have kept this stanza a crux interpretum. There is scarcely a Vedic scholar who has not in one way or another tried his hand at it. The following is an endeavor once more to clear its difficulties. The stanza reads:

asenyā vah paṇayo vācāṇsy anīṣavyāś tanvāḥ santu pāpīḥ,
ādhr̥ṣṭo va ētavā astu pānthā bṛhaspātir va ubhayā nā mṛlāt.

Ludwig (992): 'Nicht von waffenart (wenigstens) sind eure reden; gesetzt es wären dem pfeil nicht ausgesetzt eure schlechten leiber, unbewältigt der weg zu euch zu kommen, Bṛhaspati wird euch in keinem falle (ob es ist oder nicht ist) gnädig sein'.²

Grassmann: 'Nicht treffend sind, o Paṇi's eure Worte; und wären schussfest eure bösen Leiber, und undurchdringlich auch der Weg zu euch hin, Bṛhaspati wird beides nicht verschonen'.

Geldner und Kaegi, Siebenzig Lieder, p. 79: 'Mit Worten, Paṇi, könnet ihr nicht fechten; und wären schussfest eure

¹ For the text see Oldenberg, l. c., pp. 377, 381.

² Cf. his comment with other suggestions.

schlechten Leiber, der Weg zu euch auch noch so schwer zu zwingen, das alles wird Bṛhaspati nicht kümmern'.

Von Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, p. 175: 'Nicht Wunden schlagen, Panis, eure Worte! Und wären schussfest eure schlechten Leiber, wär auch der Weg zu euch schier unbezwinglich, Bṛhaspati wird beides nicht verschonen'.

Hertel, *WZKM.* xviii. 60: 'Mit Worten, Panī, könnt ihr nicht versehren; wenn schussfest eure sünd'gen Leiber wären, und unzugänglich alle eure Pfade: Bṛhaspati versagt euch seine Gnade'.

Hillebrandt, *Lieder des Rig-Veda*, p. 147: 'Wehrlos sind eure Worte, Panis. Eure Leiber, die hässlichen, mögen un durchdringlich für die Pfeile, der Weg zu euch mag unnahbar sein: Bṛhaspati wird euch in keinem Falle gnädig sein'.

The most critical word in the stanza is *ubhayā*. Those translators who take the word in the sense of 'beides' are obviously in error; the accent shows that it is adverbial (*ubhayā* from stem *ubhāya*) meaning 'in either case', 'whether so or so'. Thus Ludwig in his translation; Bartholomae, *IF.* v. 227, note 3; Oldenberg, *RV. Noten* to the passage.¹ The stanza thus contains an alternative between two suppositions; the question is where to place the hinge or seam between the alternatives. In this we must be guided by *santu* and *astu* which harbor the idea 'whether it be so or so'. Now it is clear that *santu* controls *pādas ab*; *astu pāda c*; the conclusion comes in *pāda d*. We may expect something favorable and something unfavorable to the *Panis*: 'in either case Bṛhaspati shall not spare you' (*pāda d*).

The entire first couplet contains the something unfavorable to the *Panis*. Here, namely in the word *aniṣavyās*, may be found the solution of the difficulties of the stanza. The stem *aniṣavyā* is rendered in the translations above by 'impervious to arrows'. So also, unanimously as far as I know, the lexicons (Pet. Lexs.; Grassmann; Monier Williams; Bergaigne, *Études sur le Lexique du Rig-Veda*; Hillebrandt, *Vedachrestomathie*, etc.).² The word means nearly the very opposite of that, for it contains *iṣavya* with the negative

¹ On the grammatical aspect of *ubhayā* see last Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, ii. 1, p. 21.

² Myself in the same error, *ZDMG.* xlviii. 549, note 3.

prefix. Now *iṣavya* means 'war-like' literally, conversant with 'arrows': ā rāṣṭre rājanyaḥ çūra iṣavyo (VS. ÇB. add 'tivyādhi) jāyatām VS. 22. 22; MS. 3. 12. 6: 162. 7; ÇB. 13. 1. 9. 2; āśmin rāṣṭre rājanya iṣavyah çūro mahāratho jāyatām TS. 7. 5. 18. 1; KSA. 5. 14; TB. 3. 8. 13. 1 (cf. ÇC. 8. 18. 1; JUB. 1. 4. 2). The passages speak for themselves: *iṣavya* is the same as *iṣu-bala* (by the side of *citrā-sena*; cf. *asenyā* in our stanza¹), RV. 6. 75. 9; or the *iṣumān* *vīrō* *āstā*, RV. 2. 42. 2². Therefore *aniṣavya* means, 'unwarlike', lit., 'not inured to arrows'. And by the same terms *asenyā* means 'not inured to missiles', i. e., again, synonymically, 'unwarlike'. The conception *īndraḥ* *sényah*, 1. 81. 2; 7. 30. 2, hovers before the mind of the writer as the opposite of *asenyā*.

It can be seen now what the stanza means: 'Whether (on the one hand), O Paṇis, your words be feeble, your vile bodies cowardly; or whether (on the other hand) the road to you be hard to dare, in either case Bṛhaspati (Indra's Purohita) will show you no mercy'.

While on the theme of 10. 108, I would remark that stanzas 9 and 10 have always seemed to me post festum and anti-climax. These two stanzas fit better after stanza 2, where they would in no sense disturb the sequel of the hymn. Or, they may be imagined as standing in the same position in the place of 3 and 4, of which they would be a not bad alternate version. Cf. 3^{cd}, *mitrám enā dadhāmātha gávāni gópatir no bha-vāti*, with 9^{cd}, *svásāram tvā kṛṇavāi mā púnar gā ápa te gávāni* subhage *bhajāma*; and again cf. 4^a, *náhám tám veda dábhyam* *dábhat* *sá*, with 10^a, *náhám veda bhrātṛtvám* *nó* *svasṛtvám*. I have a sort of Vālakhilya feeling as regards the two pairs. If this be so I need scarcely point out that stanza 11, in close catenation with 10, was composed after 9 and 10 got their place where they now stand in the hymn.

6. On the meaning of *ukhachid*.

Windisch, Festgruss an Otto von Böhtingk, p. 115, has made it clear that this compound means 'lame', being a periphrasis—we might say a sort of kenning—of *çronā*. The

¹ For *senā* in the sense of 'missile' see last Bloomfield, ZDMG. xlvi. 549, note 1.

² Cf. also, more remotely the type of passage such as 3. 4. 9=7. 2. 9. where *sudákṣa* seems to occupy the place of *iṣavyā* or *iṣumān*.

word is ḫπ. λεγ. in RV. 4. 19. 9, nír bhūd ukhachít sám aranta párva, 'the lame man was off; his joints fitted together'. Cf. the convincing parallel in 8. 79. 2, níh ḡronó bhūt, 'the lame man was off'. Now he finds the word ukhā in certain grammatical word-lists (*gaṇas*) among words for parts of the body, and one commentator explains it by sphik, 'hip'. There is nothing to prevent ukhā from having that meaning in a figurative way, though it is, as far as I know, not quotable in that sense in Hindu literature. Windisch next assumes that ukhachíd means 'one who has broken his hip' ('der einen hüftenbruch erlitten hat'), therefore, 'lame'.

We should expect ukhachinna rather than ukhachíd, 'hip-breaker', which would seem to state something habitual, whereas the lame man would break his hip only a single time. The analogy is with compounds like grīvachinna 'one whose neck is cut', Suparnākh. 25. 6; grīvābhagna, with the same meaning, Vētālap. 17. 6; grīvabaddha, 'bound by the neck' TS. 3. 3. 8. 3, jānvakna (comm. sāṁbhugnajānu), 'with bent knee', ApC. 10. 9. 2. Moreover there is that in the literature which leads me to suspect that ukhā in ukhachíd¹ has its primary meaning of 'pot' or 'pan'. Thus CB. 6. 6. 4. 8: yady eṣokhā bhidyeta, 'now if this pot breaks'; TS. 5. 1. 9. 2: sā (sc. ukhā) yad bhidyetārtim ārched yajamāno hanyetāsyā yajñāḥ, 'if this (pot) be broken, the sacrificer gets into trouble, his sacrifice is destroyed'; ApC. 10. 5. 3: mitrāitāṁ ta ukhāṁ paridadāmī abhittā eṣā mā bhedi, 'O Mitra, I make over to thee this pot unto unbreakableness; it shall not be broken'. Breaking of the pot (ukhābhedaṇam) is provided for ritually in KÇ. 16. 7. 8. The ukhā was fragile, being made of clay (mṛṇmayī) which was baked (ṛāpaya), VS. 11. 59, et al. The ukhā leaks easily: mā susroḥ 'do not leak', AV. 12. 3. 12; ukhāṁ sravantim 'the leaking pot', KÇ. 25. 9. 14; MÇ. 3. 5. 14. It has to be placed firmly on the altar to keep it secure: ukhā kumbhī vedyām mā vyathiṣṭhāḥ, 'do not, pot or kettle, wobble on the altar', AV. 12. 3. 23 (cf. MS. 4. 1. 3: 4. 9; TB. 3. 2. 3. 1). In case it broke a new one had to be made, Vāit. 28. 12.

It would seem then that the fragile ukhā was found to be less secure in the hands of a lame man, who might thus be nick-named 'pot-breaker'. It is not necessary to inquire how

¹The short a is rhythmical; see Leumann, Gurupūjākāumudi, p. 13.

much fancy and how much fact there was at the bottom of the notion. Persons with bodily defects are apt to be nicknamed all over the world; another Skt. designation of a lame man, *ekapad*, 'One-leg', shows the same spirit.

7. Irregular Relative Clause Constructions.

The poet Agastya, in RV. i. 176, seems to me to have difficulty in handling a relative with its antecedent pronoun, stem *ta-*, or, perhaps some metrical consideration led him to unusual passes in this same matter. Stanza 5 reads:

āvo yásya dvibárho 'rkéṣu sānuṣág asát,
ājáv índrasyendo právo vájeṣu vājinam.

Previous treatments are listed by Oldenberg, Rig-Veda Noten, i. 176. It seems to me well, in the first place, to comment upon Geldner's ingenious translation, *Ved. Stud.* ii. 129: 'Wen du, O Soma, bei einem Wettkampfe zu Ehren des doppelstarken Indra schütztest, der wird in den Liedern ordentlich sein; du beschütztest den im Kampfe siegreichen'. The formal difficulty in this rendering is the accent of *ásat*, which disqualifies it from service in the principal clause of the sentence, but points to the subordinate clause.

As regards the sense, I do not believe that there is any indication of a race ('wettkampf') in honor of Indra (if so, where?). When a Vedic text says *ájāv índrasya*, it can, in my opinion, have in mind but one thing, namely, 'in the contest for Indra', that is to say, in the attempt to secure the presence of the 'much-called' god (*puruḥútá*, and the like); see, e. g., 6. 19. 3^d, *asmái indrābhy á vavṛtsvājāu*. Moreover, Geldner's translation, as a whole, carries with it an obvious *hysteron proteron* which is suspiciously parallel to the wrong accent of *ásat*. We should expect the poet to say that Soma inspires him that composes skilful poems to secure Indra's presence, rather than that he whom Indra protects is skilful in poetry. The latter might be an idea applicable later to the court of a Bhoja Rāja; it is not a Vedic idea.

Oldenberg's suggestions are advanced hesitatingly, especially as regards *sānuṣák* which, he thinks, may be a compound = *sa-ānuṣák*, or = *sānu-ṣák*. Tho the *Padapātha* does not analyze *sānuṣák*, and tho it has but one accent, I believe with others, that we must read *sānuṣák* = *sá + ānuṣák*.

The passage seems to state: 'Thou didst aid him who is clever (ānuṣāk) in songs in honor of twice-strong (Indra); didst, O Indu (Soma), aid him in the contest for Indra (the much-called). Thou didst aid in obtaining substance him that hath substance'. For *arkēsu* ānuṣāk cf., e. g., 5. 8. 10, *gīrbhīr* *yajñebhir* ānuṣāk. In the first distich of our stanza the logical antecedent *tám*, 'him', seems to be incorporated in the relative clause as *sá* in *sānuṣāk*. This accounts for the obscuration of **sānuṣāk*, and the consequent loss of one of its accents. Moreover *yásya* stems to be for *yó asya*, or for single *yó* attracted to the case of *dvibárhasaḥ*.¹ Here is what the passage seems to say in good Vedic: *ávo* *tám* *yó* (or *yó asya*) *dvibárhaso*' *rkéṣv* ānuṣág ásat (thus the accent of ásat is justified); *áva* *ājáv* *indrasyendo*; *právo* *vájeṣu* *vájínam*. The fourth *pāda*, repeated in 1. 4. 8, looks a little like an appendage, and may have been borrowed from that stanza.

The same Agastya in the same hymn, 1. 176. 2, seems once more to have assimilated a relative pronoun (attraction) to another word in the same relative clause:

tásminn á veçayā gíro yá ékaç carṣaṇinám,
ánu svadhá yám upyáte yávaiñ na cárkṛṣad výṣā.

See Oldenberg, Rig-Veda Noten, and the literature there cited; and cf. Colinet, *Sur le sens du mot svadhā*, p. 14. Two points seem to me to control the explanation of this curious passage. First, the words *ánu svadhá* belong together = *ánu svadháḥ*²; this eliminates the need of combining *ánu* and *vap*, a combination otherwise unknown in the RV. This on the evidence of 9. 103. 5; 10. 37. 5 (*ánu svadháḥ*); 1. 33. 11; 88. 6; 3. 51. 11; 4. 33. 6; 52. 6; 7. 56. 13; 8. 88. 5 (*ánu svadhám*); and *anuṣvadhám*, frequent adverb. All mean, 'according to habit or custom'. Should this be so, then, secondly, *yám* in *pāda* c cannot be construed, unless we regard it as attracted

¹ Cf. Neisser, ZDMG, lxi. 138, and Oldenberg's note, Rig-Veda Noten, i, to 4. 21. 1 for similar phenomena regarding the relative. Cf. also the same author, Rig-Veda Noten, ii, p. 379^b (Relativsatz frei angeschlossen).

² Thus, previously, Bergaigne, iii. 9, note. The *Padapāṭha*, of course, in not explaining *svadhā* as *svadháḥ*, must have interpreted the word as nominative, subject of *upyáte* with *ánu*. All attempts to interpret on this basis strike me as forced and unbelievable.

from the nominative (*yás*) to the accusative *yávam* in its own relative clause.

Under this construction, the stanza, addressed to Soma would run as follows: 'Make enter into him (sc. Indra), who is sole (ruler) of the peoples, our songs, as a bull ploughs (i. e. makes enter) grain (into the field), grain which is sown according to (established) custom!' That is to say, omitting the attributive *pāda* b,¹ the stanza is equivalent to the following: *tásminn ā veçayā gíro yávam ná cárkṛṣad vṛṣā, ánu svadhā yá* (sc. *yávah*) *upyáte*. The sense then were clear: the poet asks Soma to enter Indra (1. 176. 1; 9. 2. 1), and, as he enters, to carry with him the poet's songs, in order to ensure Indra's gratitude to the poet. He must do this as regularly or steadily as the plough-steer, according to established custom, ploughs grain into the soil. That the expression, *yávam na cárkṛṣad vṛṣā*, does not require any further description, such as is contained in the fictitious *ánu upyáte*, 'pouring the grain in after the plough has ploughed', may be gathered from the repetition of the idea in 1. 23. 15, *góbhír yávam ná cárkṛṣat*.

In our interpretation of 1. 176. 2^c much weight is given to the habitual adverbial expressions in which various forms of *svadhā* are governed by *ánu*. I should be loath to see this argument exercise undue influence. In one RV. passage, 5. 34. 1, juxtaposition of *ánu* and *svadhā* is entirely fortuitous: *ánu* does not govern *svadhā*, but belongs to *iyate*:

ájātaçatrūm ajárá svàrvaty ánu svadhámitā dasmám *iyate*,
sunótana pácata bráhmaváhase puruṣutáya pratarám da-
dhātana.

Roth in Pet. Lex. s. v. 1. *svadhā* 3) was under the influence of those adverbial expressions when he suggested the reading *ánu svadhám ámitā* in this stanza, but *svadhā* (nominative) is here personified: 'Svadhā unaging, full of light, unmeasured follows the wise god (Indra) whose enemy is yet to be born'; see in AV. 2. 29. 7, the *úrjá svadhā ajárá*, created by Indra; and the *svadhā ajárá* of the Fathers in 12. 2. 32.

¹ Repeated in much better connection in 1. 7. 9. In our stanza the *pāda* is a dislocated fragment.

Once more, AV. 6. 53. 1^c, ánu occurs before svadhá under rather trying circumstances: ánu svadhá cikitām sómo agníh. Whitney in his Translation observes that the compound verb ánu + ci does not occur elsewhere in the language but renders, 'let the svadhá favor [me; let] Soma, Agni'. Ludwig, Der Rig-Veda, vol. iii, p. 506 translates, 'durch die Svadhá denke daran Soma, Agni'. He seems to make ánu govern svadhá as a homophonous instrumental. I have thought of correcting to ánu svadhám (or svadháḥ), and thus escaping the dubious combination ánu + ci; cf. AV. 6. 96. 3, sómas táni svadháyā nah punātu; AV. 18. 3. 8, sám sómena mádasva sám svadhábhīḥ. But why should the text of 6. 53. 1 have slipped from the line of least resistance (ánu svadhám, or ánu svadháḥ) into ánu svadhá?

An incorporated relative conversely attracts secondarily its subject in the clause which contains the attraction. RV. 10. 17. 9:

sárasvatim yám pitáro hávante dakṣiná yajñám abhinák-
ṣamānāḥ,
sahasrārghám ilö átra bhāgám rāyás pósam yájamāneṣu
dhehi.

Here sárasvatim is attracted from the vocative or nominative to the accusative yám: the attraction is quite as illogical as that of yásya for yáḥ in i. 176. 5, or yám for yáḥ in i. 176. 2.

Similarly in i. 183. 1, tám yuñjāthám mánaṣo yó jáviyān trivandhuró vṛṣanā yás tricakráḥ, 'Yoke, O ye two bulls, that car which is swifter than the mind, has three pole-boards,¹ and three wheels'. Here trivandhuró . . . yás tricakráḥ (for tri-vandhurám, etc.) is attracted to the articular relative phrase mánaṣo yó jáviyān (formula in i. 117. 2; 118. 1; 10. 112. 2).

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

¹For the meaning of vandhúra see my forthcoming work, Rig-Veda Repetitions, HOS., vol. xx, p. 236. The work comprises volumes xx and xxiv of Harvard Oriental Series.

II.—POMPEIUS TROGUS AND JUSTINUS.

I. TROGUS.

The Epitome of the work of Pompeius Trogus, by Justinus, does not reveal much that is definite in regard to the work of either writer. However, there are two statements of Justinus indicating in a general way the chronology of Trogus. At the end of Book 43 is found the following: *In postremo libro Trogus ait maiores suos originem a Vocontiis ducere; avum suum Trogum Pompeium Sertoriano bello civitatem a Cn. Pompeio percepisse, patruum Mithridatico bello turmas equitum sub eodem Pompeio duxisse; patrem quoque sub C. Caesare militasse epistularumque ac legationum et anuli curam habuisse.* From this we may infer that the birth of Trogus was not far from the middle of the first century B. C., and that he was of the same generation as Livy. The other passage is in 38, 3, 11 *quam orationem dignam duxi, cuius exemplum brevitati huius operis insererem; quam obliquam Pompeius Trogus exposuit, quoniam in Livio et in Sallustio reprehendit, quod contiones directas pro sua oratione operi suo inserendo historiae modum excesserint.* We can not tell whether this remark was in connection with the oration given, or was prefatory to the entire work. All that we can definitely know is that some parts of the work of Trogus were written after some parts of the work of Livy.

The parallel passages collected by Crohn, *De Trogi Pompei apud antiquos auctoritate*, point to Trogus as one of the sources of Valerius Maximus. This can be illustrated by Val. Max. 9, 10, Ext. 1 and Just. 1, 8, 9. The same fact is stated by Herodotus 1, 214, yet the variations in the form of statement indicate that Val. Max. drew from a preceding Latin writer. Vell. Pat. 1, 8, 3 and Just. 2, 7, 1 are also very much alike; and these and other passages show the utilization of Trogus by both writers, and fix some time in the reign of Tiberius as the date before which the work of Trogus must have been published. Noticeable is the statement in 39, 1, 3 *sed dum aliena adfectat,*

ut adsolet fieri, propria . . . amisit, for it changes the order of the parts, one of the verbs, and, from singular to plural, the two adjectives of *Phaedrus* 1, 4, 1,

Amittit merito proprium qui alienum adpetit.

Considering the nature of the work of *Justinus*, the variation he has used seems to have been derived by *Trogus* from *Phaedrus*, and if it was, the statement of the Monk *Matthew* in his *Flores Historiarum* can not be true, for he says, anno divinae incarnationis nono, *Caesare Augusto imperii sui* Liūm agente annum *Trogus Pompeius Chronica sua terminavit*; see *Schanz, Geschichte der Röm. Litt.*, sec. 328.

As *Trogus* criticised both *Sallust* and *Livy*, it is probable that he made free use of both. The long list of parallel examples collected by *Sellge, De Studiis in Sallustio Crispo a Pompeio Trogo et Justino epitomatore collocatis*, shows that *Trogus* gathered with a free hand from *Sallust*. It is safe to assume that he made use of *Livy* in the same way, with the possible difference that he may have used the parts of the work of *Livy* as they appeared.

Some rhetorical features of the work of *Justinus* find parallels in the work of *Livy*. This does not necessarily show that one borrowed from the other, but that both may have been subject to the same influences, and may have been affected in the same way. To illustrate this, some passages will be quoted from *Justinus* having similar elements in *Livy*; see the *Historical Attitude of Livy*, A. J. P. XXV, 15 foll. *Just.* 3, 7, 16 *bellum . . . quod priusquam expono, de Siciliae situ pauca dicenda sunt*; 11, 15, 1 *interea Dareus . . . vincitur, credo ita diis immortalibus iudicantibus, ut . . . finiretur*. The plural *acepimus* occurs in 7, 1, 5; and 20, 1, 15 *quid Tarentini, quos a Lacedaemone profectos spuriosque vocatos a?* Compare in 42, 2, 7 *sed quoniam in Armeniam transitum facimus, origo eius paulo altius repetenda est*. Similar to these are *memoravimus* in 20, 5, 1; and *videmus* in 20, 1, 8. The potential subjunctive is found in 6, 2, 7 *postquam Agesilaum . . . misere, non facile dixerim, quod aliud par ducum tam bene comparatum fuerit*. *Livy's* method is also followed in referring to other parts of the work: 2, 5, 9; 23, 3, 2 *sicut supra dictum est*; 10, 2, 1 *cuius*

mentio supra habita est. We find in 4, 1, 1; and 20, 1, 16 ferunt; in 42, 3, 7; and 44, 3, 1 multi auctores prodidere. There are also some generalizing statements: 5, 1, 11 ut fit; 2, 13, 2 et in maius, sicuti mos est, omnia extollens; 39, 1, 3 ut adsolet fieri. Here also may be placed a few maxims: 6, 1, 1 Lacedaemonii, more ingenii humani quo plura habent eo ampliora cupientes; 20, 5, 3 tantum virtutis paupertas adversus insolentes divitias habet, tantoque insperata interdum sperata victoria certior est; 6, 8, 2 sicuti telo si primam aciem praefregeris, reliquo ferro vim nocendi sustuleris. There are a few other occurrences of the indefinite second person: 4, 1, 18 ea est enim procul insipientibus natura loci, ut sinum maris, non transitum putes, quo cum accesseris, discedere ac seiungi promuntoria . . . arbitrere. Other instances are in the imperfect: 2, 12, 24 cerneret; 14, 6, 11 posses; 2, 9, 12; and 13, 1, 10 putares; and the best illustrative passage 11, 6, 5 ut non tam milites quam magistros militiae lectos putares. Ordines quoque nemo nisi sexagenarius duxit, ut, si principia castrorum cerneret, senatum te priscae alicuius rei publicae videre diceret.

Here and there are found indefinite statements not unlike some of Livy's: 4, 1, 16 quantum nunc admirationis, tantum antiquis terroris dederit; 15, 2, 9 tanto honestius tunc bella gerebantur quam nunc amicitiae coluntur; 41, 1, 1 Parthi, penes quos velut divisione orbis cum Romanis facta nunc Orientis imperium est, Scytharum exules fuere; 36, 3, 9 facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus. These are interesting contrasts, but they give nothing definite in regard to the time of writing; and the same is true of statements in Trogus which were influenced by what Livy had already written.

A number of short passages in the first book of Livy are similar to ones found in the forty-third book of Justinus: L. 1, 1, 11 oppidum condunt; Aeneas ab nomine uxoris Lavinium appellat: J. 43, 1, 12 urbem ex nomine uxoris Lavinium condidit; L. 1, 5, 4 sic Numitor ad supplicium Remus deditur: J. 43, 2, 9 tunc a rege Numitori in ultiōnem traditur; L. 1, 4, 3 sacerdos vincita in custodiam datur; pueros in profluentem aquam mitti iubet: J. 43, 2, 4 pueros exponi iubet et puellam vinculis onerat. The reversal of the order of the parts in the last statement is noticeable, as also in some others which may have been derived from a common source: L. 37, 45, 12 animos

. . . eosdem in omni fortuna gessimus gerimusque, neque eos secundae res extulerunt nec adversae minuerunt: J. 31, 8, 8 Africano praedicante, Romanos neque, si vincantur, animos minuere neque, si vincant, secundis rebus insolescere. Illustrations of other statements which may have a common source are as follows: L. 37, 1, 10 experiri libebat, utrum plus regi Antiocho in Hannibale victo an in victore Africano consuli legionibusque Romanis auxiliī foret: J. 31, 7, 2 ut intellegeret Antiochus non maiorem fiduciam se in Hannibale victo quam Romanos in victore Scipione habere; L. 37, 37, 3 Iliensibus in omni rerum verborumque honore ab se oriundos Romanos praeferentibus et Romanis laetis origine sua: J. 31, 8, 1 Iliensibus Aenean ceterosque cum eo duces a se profectos, Romanis se ab his procreatos referentibus. In the last pair quoted we have *praeferentibus: referentibus*, in the first Africano: Scipione, and in L. 39, 50, 10 P. Scipionem: J. 32, 4, 9 Scipionis Africani. If these are independent statements it is strange that the writers did not hit on the same form of statement in one at least of the three variations cited.

The changes made by Philip of Macedon are described in J. 8, 5, 9 non quidem pavor ille hostilis nec discursus per urbem militum erat, non tumultus armorum, non bonorum atque hominum rapina, sed tacitus maeror et luctus, verentibus, ne ipsae lacrimae pro contumacia haberentur . . . nunc sepulcra maiorum, nunc veteres penates, nunc tecta, in quibus geniti erant quibusque genuerant, considerabant. This adapts Livy 1, 29, 2 non quidem fuit tumultus ille nec pavor . . . clamor hostilis et cursus per urbem armatorum . . . sed silentium triste ac tacita maestitia . . . cum larem ac penates tectaque, in quibus natus quisque educatusque esset, relinquentes exirent. At one point the setting in Justinus is simpler, for he has *tacitus maeror ac luctus* for Livy's *silentium triste ac tacita maestitia*—silence sad and silent sadness. On the other hand the statement of Livy is expanded by Trogus with *nunc . . . nunc . . . nunc*, and instead of *in quibus natus quisque educatusque*, there is given a new contrast *geniti erant . . . genuerant*. There is also a noticeable resemblance in many shorter passages, and of these some will be given from each of the decades of Justinus. J. 2, 7, 4 qui velut novam civitatem legibus conderet: L. 1, 19, 1 urbem novam, conditam vi et armis, iure eam legibusque ac

moribus de integro condere parat ; J. 5, 1, 5 and 43, 5, 4 velut ad commune extinguendum incendium concurrent : L. 28, 42, 10 velut ad commune restinguendum incendium concurrent ; J. 6, 8, 6 ut sumptus funeri defuerit : L. 2, 33, 11 sumptus funeri defuit ; J. 13, 1, 4 omnes barbarae gentes . . . ut parentem luxerunt : L. 2, 7, 4 matronae annum ut parentem eum luxerunt ; J. 13, 6, 2 quippe hostes . . . recepti occisis coniugibus et liberis domos quisque suas . . . incenderunt eoque congestis etiam serviis semet ipsi praecipitant : L. 21, 14, 1 in ignem . . . plerique semet ipsi praecipitaverunt ; and in sec. 4 inclusi cum coniugibus ac liberis domos super se ipsos concremaverunt ; J. 12, 15, 1 agnoscere se fatum domus *suae* ait : L. 27, 51, 12 agnoscere se fortunam Carthaginis fertur dixisse ; J. 22, 8, 6 paululum modo admiterentur : L. 35, 5, 11 obtestabatur, ut paulum admiterentur ; J. 24, 5, 12 non votis agendum : L. 22, 5, 2 nec inde votis . . . evadendum ; J. 32, 4, 9 insignis hic annus trium toto orbe maximorum imperatorum mortibus fuit, Hannibal et Philopoemenis et Scipionis Africani ; cf. 5, 8, 7 insignis hic annus et expugnatione Athenarum et morte Darei, regis Persarum, et exilio Dionysii, Siciliae tyranni, fuit : L. 39, 50, 10 velut ad insignem notam huius anni, memoriae mandatum sit tres claros imperatores eo anno decessisse, Philopoemenem, Hannibalem, P. Scipionem ; J. 42, 1, 3 pueritiae sibi flore conciliatum : L. 21, 2, 3 flore aetatis . . . conciliatus ; J. 44, 2, 2 si extraneus deest, domi hostem querunt : L. 30, 44, 8 si foris hostem non habet, domi invenit. The scene described by Livy in 1, 40, 7 dum intentus in eum se rex totus averteret, alter elatam securim in caput deiecit, is reproduced in J. 16, 5, 15 dum alterum dicentem intentus audit tyrannus, ab altero obtruncatur, with the grammatical correction of Livy's imperfect subjunctive with *dum*. Owing to the loss of the larger part of Livy's work it can not be absolutely determined whether Trogus made any use of the work of Livy after book forty-five.

Though there are resemblances in the language used indicating that Trogus adapted the words of Livy to his own uses, the historical spheres of the two writers are quite distinct. The interpretation of this is that Trogus avoided what had already been given by Livy. Trogus in book 43 has a section referring to the days of Romulus up to the seizure of the Sabine women. Then it is stated in 43, 3, 2 *finitimis populis armis subactis, primo*

Italiae, mox orbis imperium quaesitum. There follows (sec. 3) a little piece of antiquarian lore, *per ea tempora adhuc reges hastas pro diademate habebant*, and continuing, the narrative takes up the founding of Massilia and the affairs of the Ligurians in the days of the Tarquins. Book 44 deals with Spain, and tells of Geryon and Habis, and of Viriatus in 44, 2, 7 in *tanta saeculorum serie nullus illis dux magnus praeter Viriatum fuit*, qui annis decem Romanos varia victoria fatigavit. Florus has in 2, 17, 15 *per quattuordecim annos*, restating the facts from Livy; see Per. 52 and 54. Although the grandfather of Trogus was in the Sertorian war (J. 43, 5, 11), neither Justinus nor the Prologi make mention of Sertorius. In contrast with this, Florus gives an entire chapter (3, 22) to the war, and Livy (see Per. 90 foll.) described it in such detail that Trogus did not write anything about it.

II. JUSTINUS.

Justinus has a few references which we may assume were true for his own time as well as for that of Trogus. We find in 20, 1, 6 *multae urbes . . . vestigia Graeci moris ostentant*, and again in sec. 16 *Thurinorum urbem condidisse Philocteten ferunt*; *ibique adhuc monumentum eius visitur*, et *Herculis sagittae in Apollinis templo, quae fatum Troiae fuere*. *Metapontini quoque in templo Minervae ferramenta, quibus Epeos, a quo conditi sunt, equum Troianum fabricavit, ostentant*. The first of these is evidently complimentary to Augustus (see Suet. Aug. 7). 33, 2, 7 *Macedonia . . . libera facta est legesque, quibus adhuc utitur, a Paulo accepit*; 41, 5, 6 *cuius memoriae hunc honorem Parthi tribuerunt, ut omnes exinde reges suos Arsacis nomine nuncupent*. Similar to this are 41, 6, 8; and 41, 1, 1 where are mentioned the extension by Mithridates of the Parthian power to the Euphrates, and the division of the world between the Parthians and the Romans. These last passages, taken in connection with the description of Armenia in 42, 2, 7 foll., show that Justinus wrote before 226 A. D. when the Parthian power was overthrown, and Armenia became a part of the new kingdom. That Justinus would not have left unchanged a statement of such wide political significance, if it were not applicable to his own times, is indicated by 41. 5, 8

Tertius Parthis rex Priapatius fuit, sed et ipse Arsaces dictus. Nam sicut supra dictum est, omnes reges suos hoc nomine, sicuti Romani Caesares Augustosque, cognominavere. We may then safely place the date of Justinus between 226 A. D. and the time at which the Romans began to use *Caesares* and *Augusti* as official titles for the emperors.

The line of the Caesars as is shown by the work of Suetonius was continuous to the reign of Nero, with whom, Suet. Galba 1 progenies Caesarum . . . defecit. Galba, Otho and Vitellius have the title *Imperator*, while Vespasian and his sons are undesignated. But it is said of Otho, Vita 7 ab infima plebe appellatus Nero . . . primisque epistulis . . . Neronis cognomen adiecit; compare Titus 7 denique propalam alium Neronem et opinabantur et praedicabant. The movement toward the title is shown in Nero 46 *conclamatum est ab universis: Tu facies, Auguste!* and by Vitellius 8 cognomen . . . Augusti distulit, Caesaris in perpetuum recusavit, Vitellius following the example of Tiberius, Suet. Tib. 26 ac ne Augusti quidem nomen, quamquam hereditarium, ulla nisi ad reges ac dynastas epistulis addidit. The words of Ovid, Fasti 1, 531

et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit

are merely a wish, while those of Seneca, de Clem. 1, 14, 2 *Magnos et Felices et Augustos diximus* are complimentary plurals, indicating merely personal attitude. The official recognition of the words as titles came later.

Aelius Spartianus tells us in his life of Helius, Hist. Aug. 2, 2, 1 nihil habet in sua vita memorabile, nisi quod primus tantum Caesar est appellatus, non testamento, ut antea solebat, neque eo modo quo Traianus est adoptatus, sed eo prope genere, quo nostris temporibus a vestra clementia Maximianus atque Constantius Caesares dicti sunt quasi quidam principum filii virtute designati augustae maiestatis heredes. A similar account is found in 2, 2, 6. In 2, 5, 12-14 he gives the official establishment of the title Augustus: *Eius est filius Antoninus Verus, qui adoptatus est a Marco, vel certe cum Marco et cum eodem aequale gessit imperium. Nam ipsi sunt qui primi duo Augusti appellati sunt, et quorum fastis consularibus sic nomina praescribuntur, ut dicantur non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti.*

Tantumque huius rei et novitas et dignitas valuit, ut fasti consulares nonnulli ab his sumerent ordinem consulum. He also states in 2, 7, 5 his intention of giving the history of all qui vel Caesares vel Augusti vel principes appellati sunt, quique in adoptionem venerunt, vel imperatorum filii aut parentes Caesarum nomine consecrati sunt.

Interpreting the words of Justinus by the facts here stated, he is to be placed between the reign of Hadrian and 226 A. D. If there can be any closer determination of the date, it must be on the basis of the language used.

The words in the Preface 4 Horum igitur quattuor et quadraginta voluminum (nam tot idem edidit) per otium, quo in urbe versabamur, cognitione quaeque dignissima excerpti et omissis his, quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo erant necessaria, breve veluti florum corpusculum feci, ut haberent et qui Graece didicissent, quo admonerentur, et qui non didicissent, quo instruerentur. These words state the method of Justinus, his object, and let us know that his home was not at Rome.

1. The Prologi of the work of Trogus show that many of the topics presented in the original work are not mentioned at all by Justinus. This is well shown by book 19, one-half of which is taken up with an account of the return of Himilco to Carthage, and book 33 which is reduced to 55 lines giving an introduction to and the closing of the Macedonian War, with an interesting episode—the wonderful daring of M. Cato, son of the orator. The fulness of the details given in the episodes makes it probable that Justinus has transferred intact, or nearly so, a passage from Trogus to his own work. Outside of the episodes we can not tell what changes were made by Justinus in the narrative, though we may assume that his method was similar to that of Orosius in reducing the work of Justinus.

Augustine has the following statement in *de Civ. Dei* 4, 6 *init.* Iustinus, qui Graecam vel potius peregrinam Trogum Pompeium secutus non Latine tantum, sicut ille, verum etiam breviter scripsit historiam, opus librorum suorum sic incipit. Then he gives a quotation exactly reproducing the words of Justinus, and adding qualibet autem fide rerum vel iste vel Trogus scripserit. A statement similar to this is found in 5, 12 Catonis verba sive Sallustii, the latter word indicating the real

author. This utilization of Justinus shows that by the time of Augustine the Epitome had supplanted the original work, and the same is true for Orosius. He uses Justinus, but he has in 4, 6, 1 and 6 Pompeius Trogus et Justinus; and in 1, 8, 2-5 he has a quotation, introduced by the words Pompeius historicus eiusque breviator Iustinus docet, and followed by the words haec Justinus. The quotation in 1, 10, 2-5 is preceded by ait enim Pompeius sive Iustinus hoc modo, while he has in section 6 item Iustinus adserit. These passages show us that though Trogus is mentioned, the work of Orosius is not a parallel one to that of Justinus, but is a reduced reproduction of the work of Justinus, as the work of Justinus was of the work of Trogus.

There are few differences in the statement of facts, and some of these arise from improper condensation, as in J. 11, 5, 1 proficisciens ad Persicum bellum omnes novercae suae cognatos, quos Philippus in excelsiorem dignitatis locum provéhens imperiis praefeccerat, interfecit: O. 3, 16, 3 profecturus ad Persicum bellum omnes cognatos ac proximos suos interfecit. Two other statements will illustrate some of the ways in which Orosius has varied from Justinus: J. 8, 3, 6 inde veluti rebus egregie gestis in Cappadociam traicit, ubi bello pari perfidia gesto captisque per dolum et occisis finitimus regibus universam provinciam imperio Macedoniae adiungit: O. 3, 12, 18 post haec in Cappadociam transiit, ibique bellum pari perfidia gessit, captos per dolum finitimos reges interfecit totamque Cappadociam imperio Macedoniae subdidit. As in this, synonymous verbs are freely used by Orosius, and finite verbs take the place of ablatives absolute or *vice versa* according as statements are expanded or condensed. Of the great mass of changed statements only a few will be given, illustrating types of changes: Equivalent statements: J. 9, 4, 7 bona omnium occupavit: O. 3, 14, 1 omnes bonis privavit; different prepositional usage: J. 5, 9, 2 ad terrorem omnium interficiunt: O. 2, 17, 7 in exemplum timoremque reliquorum trucidant; *cum* instead of *et*: J. 6, 7, 3 quippe senes et cetera inbellis aetas: O. 3, 2, 6 armati enim senes cum reliqua turba inbellis aetatis; variation in statement of temporal relations: J. 6, 5, 1 quibus rebus cognitis: O. 3, 1, 21 cum comperrissent; J. 6, 6, 1 dum haec geruntur . . . legatos mittit, per quos iubet omnes ab armis discedere: O. 3, 1, 25 interea . . . per legatos, ut ab armis discederent . . . imperavit. Variation

in adverbs, and especially in particles, as *velut: quasi, igitur: itaque, quoque: vero, ibi: ubi, interim: interea, non solum: non tantum* is noticeable, as well as with some other correlatives: J. 2, 9, 12 *pugnatum est tanta virtute, ut hinc viros, inde pecudes putares: O. 2, 8, 10 tanta in eo bello diversitas certandi fuit, ut ex alia parte viri ad occidendum parati, ex alia pecudes ad moriendum praeparatae putarentur.* Changes in the order of words meet us at every turn, as in J. 2, 14, 7 *eodem forte die . . . etiam navali proelio in Asia sub monte Mycale adversus Persas dimicatum est: O. 2, 11, 4 nam forte eodem die . . . pars Persici exercitus in Asia sub monte Mycale navali proelio dimicabat.*

2. The words of Justinus *per otium quo in urbe versabamur* show that his home was not at Rome. If not an Italian, was he an African? To determine the probability of this we shall compare his phraseology with that of some of the representatives of the African school—Florus, Apuleius, Tertullian and Arnobius. And in making the comparisons we must bear in mind the limitations of each. The work of Justinus professes to be a book of excerpts, and we need expect only such evidences of originality as are called for in welding together the selected portions of Trogus with a slightly changed syntax and vocabulary to suit the usage of the time of Justinus. It is not possible to determine definitely what is due to Justinus, and what is the residue from Trogus. Forty per cent. of the vocabulary of Justinus is not found in Caesar, and in this mass are about two hundred abstract nouns. As an illustration we take the word *successio*, mostly post-Augustan, with examples quoted from Tacitus, Suetonius, Justinus and Apuleius. Yet Schirmer¹ calls attention to the fact that the word occurs five times in the letters of Caelius. Justinus has in 11, 1, 8 *pro contione* which is not used by Caesar and Cicero, yet is found in a letter of Pollio, Cic. ad Fam. 10, 31, 5, and is the prevailing form in Tacitus and Suetonius. These are illustrations of the possibility that in the works of Brutus, of Caelius, of Calvus, of Pollio and of Trogus, may have been freely used many expressions which are catalogued as late, because by chance they are found in Justinus and in writers near his time.

¹ K. Schirmer, Ueber die Sprache des M. Brutus in den bei Cicero überlieferten Briefen. Progr. Metz, 1884.

However, as the father of Trogus had the care of the epistles of Caesar it is not too much to assume that the style of the son was a reflection of the style of Caesar, and that stylistic variations from Caesar, in harmony with a later usage, are due to Justinus. As an illustration of this we may take the final infinitive. Occasionally used by poets, it is avoided by the Plinies, Quintilian, Suetonius and Tacitus, but is found in Apuleius, Gellius and Justinus. We may well distrust the correctness of the text of earlier examples which are cited, and believe that Justinus was one of the first of the prose writers using the construction. Justinus has in 18, 1, 1 *et ipsis auxilio adversus Romanos indigentibus*, a post-Augustan construction of *indigens* with the ablative, instances of which are to be found in the works of Seneca, as in B. 4, 3, 2 *reges aliena ope non indigentes*.

At the head of the recognized African writers is Florus, if you will, historian, poet, rhetorician; see Wölfflin, *Archiv* 6, 1 foll. He does not make excerpts as does Justinus, but he takes some of the material of Livy, and weaves it into a new fabric. A few passages will illustrate this: F. 1, 1, 6 *gemini erant*: L. 1, 6, 4 *quoniam gemini essent*; F. 1, 1, 16 *cum contionem haberet ante urbem apud Caprae paludem, e conspectu ablatus est*: L. 1, 16, 1 *cum contionem in campo ad Caprae paludem haberet, subito coorta tempestas . . . tam denso regem operuit nimbo, ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit*; F. 1, 7, 2 *regnum . . . rapere maluit quam expectare*: L. 1, 47, 2 *defuisse . . . qui habere quam sperare regnum mallet*; F. 1, 13, 5 *ab ultimis terrarum oris et cingente omnia Oceano*: L. 5, 37, 2 *ab Oceano terrarumque ultimis oris bellum ciente*; F. 2, 6, 7 *'in hoc ego sinu bellum pacemque porto; utrum eligitis? suclamantibus bellum, 'bellum igitur' inquit 'accipite'*. Et excusso in media curia toga gremio non sine horrore, quasi plane sinu bellum ferret, effudit: L. 21, 18, 13 *tum Romanus sinu ex toga facto 'Hic' inquit 'vobis bellum et pacem portamus: utrum placet, sumite'*. Sub hanc vocem haud minus ferociter, daret utrum vellet, suclamatum est. Et cum is iterum sinu effuso bellum dare dixisset, accipere se omnes respondebant.

Apuleius, fabulist, philosopher, pleader, gives the completest example of secular African Latinity. But there are some

noticeable differences between his *Metamorphoses* and the remainder of his works. As a temporal particle, *ut* occurs only in the former, and also nearly all the instances of *ubi*. *Donec* is also limited to the same work, and *quoad* also with the exception of *Flor.* 2, 14, 47 *quoad vixit*; and *de Magia* 58, 523 *quoad habitavit*. *Quippe* occurs about one-third as frequently in the *Metamorphoses* as in his other works, in the first most freely with *cum*, in the latter with *qui*.

Tertullian 'acris et vehementis *igenii*', and Arnobius, *expugnator et propugnator fidei*, are both prolific in expression, and for this reason their vocabulary has but very little in common with that of Justinus. There is however one rhetorical feature common to them all.

Play on words, whether as rhyme (see Wölfflin, *Archiv* 1, 350 foll., *Der Reim im Lateinischen*) or as alliteration (see Wölfflin, *Archiv* 3, 443 foll., *Zur Alliteration und zum Reime*), is a noticeable feature of the African school, and Apuleius and Tertullian are among the best representatives; see H. Hoppe, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian*, pp. 162-172; sec. 5 *Der Reim*; sec. 6 *Das Wortspiel*. Some good illustrations are found in Justinus: 4, 1, 10 *nunc hic fremitum . . . nunc illic gemitum*, on which Wölfflin remarks "ganz afrikanisch". 6, 1, 5 *differant bella, quam gerant*; 24, 5, 10 *nomina sicuti numina*; 31, 7, 9 *belli ea irritamenta, non pacis blandimenta*. The words are sometimes akin: 11, 5, 10 *iaculum . . . iecit*; 18, 4, 12 *involuta . . . involucris involuta*; 43, 4, 10 *insidianti regi insidiae praetenduntur*; 13, 8, 6 *insidiae in insidiatores versae, et qui securum adgresuros se putabant, securis . . . occursum est*. As in the last example, contrasts of the different cases are found: 12, 12, 9 *Antipatri . . . Antipatrum*; 12, 15, 10 *viro forti . . . virum fortem*; 18, 2, 2 *externo . . . externis*. We find the same usage with verbs also: 5, 6, 8 *cum paulo ante salutem desperaverint, nunc non desperent victoriam*; 5, 8, 8 *mutato statu . . . condicio mutatur*; 11, 14, 4 *patere . . . patuerit*; 12, 6, 5 *modo personam occisi, modo causam occidendi considerans*.

In discussing the functions of an orator, Fronto has on page 139 *N. castella verborum, conciliabula verborum loco, gradus, pondera, aetates dignitatesque dinoscere . . . quae ratio sit verba geminandi et interdum trigeminandi, nonnumquam quadruplicia, saepe quinque aut eo amplius superlata ponendi*. In

Fronto's own letters three terms are most freely used. In this respect the usage has the widest sweep in Apuleius and Arnobius, the number of terms given ranging from three to a dozen. Occurrences are not uncommon in Justinus, e. g. 5, 6, 9 *neque* is miles . . . *neque eae vires* . . . *neque ea scientia*; 5, 7, 5 *non pueros imprudentia, non senes debilitas, non mulieres sexus imbecillitas domi tenet*. So far as these features are concerned the color of the narrative in Justinus is like that of the African writers. An archaic color also is not lacking, and among the terms discussed by Wölfflin (Archiv 7, 467 foll., Minucius Felix) as archaic touches, Justinus has *prosapia, perpes, indolesco*, and *in totum*; see Archiv 4, 146.

Other evidences of the African character of the Latinity of Justinus is found in the African Inscriptions. B. Kübler (Archiv 8, 161 foll., Die lateinische Sprache auf afrikan. Inschriften) in the list of words given shows that in some respects the vocabulary of the inscriptions is similar to that of Justinus. This is most noticeable in the use of abstracts in *-tas*, *aeternitas*, *exiguitas*, *frugalitas*, *levitas*, *posteritas*, and *pubertas*. Of adjectives in *-alis* are given *extemporalis*, *venalis* and (*matronalis*). Here as in Justinus are found *supra modum*, *circa = erga, una cum, nec non et, pariter ac* and *et*. Considering that Fronto does not use *ad instar* which is found in Justinus 36, 3, 2, Wölfflin, Archiv 2, 590, holds that Justinus is later than Fronto. Apuleius uses the phrase most freely, and occurrences are not lacking in other African writers. *Adunatis iv regibus* is in the ablative, as in most of the passages of Justinus in which this favorite verb is found. Instead of *pluvia*, Justinus has *imber* which is found eleven times in the inscriptions. *Grandis* and *modicus*, and perhaps *natalis* for *natalis dies* occur in both. Here are also found expressions similar to some used by Florus and Apuleius, e. g. *amator studiorum*: Florus 1, 1, 5 *ipse fluminis amator et montium*; *columnen morum*: Apul. Flor. 3, 16, 73 *ad honoris mei tribunal et columnen*. If these expressions illustrate the African coloring of the narrative of Florus and Apuleius, they may be held to do the same for that of Justinus.

There are a few other rhetorical features in which the coloring does not differ from that of the African writers. All agree in the limited use of *etsi* and *quamvis*, Justinus having the latter but once. *Licet*, not in Florus nor Suetonius, occurs twice in

Justinus, and more freely in Apuleius. They also agree in the limited use of *tamquam*, but differ widely with *velut* and *quasi*. In the use of the formula *non modo . . . sed etiam* and its equivalents, Justinus, Apuleius, Tertullian and Arnobius are alike in the tendency to use *verum* instead of *sed*, but the usage with *modo*, *solum* and *tantum* varies.

The list of individual constructions and expressions found in Justinus and the African writers is a long one, but only the most important need be mentioned. A *quod*-clause, instead of the accusative and infinitive, is noticeable in Justinus, and flourishes in Apuleius, and the same is true of words in *-bundus*. *Temporis* with *tum* or *tunc* is found in Just. 1, 4, 4; 3, 6, 6; 31, 2, 6; Apul. Met. 3, 4, 180; 10, 13, 700; 11, 24, 804; and Tert. de Baptismo 14 *tunc temporis ad Corinthios scripta sunt*. The correlatives *primum . . . mox* and *hinc . . . inde* are not unusual. Some of the words are well suited for Christian usage. Cicero uses *fragilitas* and *infirmitas*, but Seneca seems to have given them universal application, as in Ep. 15, 12 *oblitus fragilitatis humanae*. Compare with this Just. 23, 3, 12 in *ostentationem fragilitatis humanae*; and Apul. Met. 9, 18, 627 which resemble Arnobius 6, 2 *infirmitatis humanae*; cf. Min. Felix 12, 3 *nondum agnoscis fragilitatem*. *Pagani*, *parvuli*, *praesumptio*, and *reatus* may be placed in the same class. We find in Arnobius 1, 40 *patibulo adfixus*; and in 1, 62 *patibulo pendere*. In Justinus *patibulum* occurs twice with *suffigere*, 22, 7, 8; and 30, 2, 7; and also in Apul. Met. 6, 31, 443; and 10, 12, 700; cf. 4, 10, 259; and 6, 32, 445. The use of the word for *crux* judging by the occurrences in these three writers would seem to be African. With their statements we may compare Suet. Jul. Caes. 74 *suffixurum cruci*; Dom. 11 c. *figeret*. *Compesco*, *delitesco*, *indubitatus*, *inexpiabilis*, *parricidalis* and *poenalis* are also common to Justinus and the Christian writers.

There are a number of terms, chiefly secular, which tell the same story as those already mentioned. Tides external and internal are indicated by *aestus*; Just. 23, 3, 8 *periculorum*; Florus 2, 7, 1 *quodam quasi aestu et torrente fortunae*; 4, 2, 64 *quidam fugae a.*; Just. 11, 13, 3 *magnō se aestu liberatum*; Apul. Met. 3, 1, 172 *aestus invadit animum*. Both Justinus and Apuleius (Met. 10, 3, 684; and de Magia 64, 536) have

causa et origo; cf. Arnobius 2, 52 c. atque o. nascendi. *Com-militium, divisio, ducatus, medela, pernitas* (see Archiv 8, 452), *proeliator, proventus, respectu*, and *tirocinia* are among the nouns showing the African connections of Justinus. *Interiecto tempore* and similar expressions are characteristic of Justinus, and are found in Apul. Met. 7, 20, 485 nec multis i. diebus; 10, 27, 729 paucis; 7, 23, 491 spatio modico i.; as also in Sen. B. 3, 1, 2. *Iterato* is freely used by Justinus and is found in Apul. Met. 9, 25, 641, as also in Tert. adv. Iud. 13. *Nihil tale metuentes* occurs in Justinus 25, 2, 6; and Florus 2, 12, 5; cf. Sen. D. 12, 15, 2. Compare Justinus 19, 3, 12 obseratis foribus with Apul. Met. 9, 2, 596; 10, 19, 713 fore; 8, 14, 546 valvis. We find in Just. 31, 5, 3 veniam deinde libertati praefatus; Apul. Met. 1, 1, 9 en ecce praefamur v.; 11, 23, 802 praefatus deum v.; Flora. 1, 1, 3 praefanda v.; de Mag. 75, 551 honos auribus p. The arrangement *versa vice* which begins with Seneca, occurs also in Justinus and Apuleius; see Archiv 4, 67.

There are a few points in the use of pronouns which are worthy of notice. Sallust has in Iug. 9, 4 *huiuscemodi*, and to this may be due Just. 29, 2, 7 h. oratione. It is also used by Apul. in Met. 2, 12, 117; 9, 18, 628; de Mag. 13, 415 versibus. Paul Thielman, Archiv 7, 362 *Der Ersatz des Reciprocums im Lateinischen*, Invicem, Mutuo, Vicissim, presents the case for these words with the reflexive, showing that "Völlig durchgedrungen ist inv.+ Refl. zur Zeit der Antonine". The use of *mutuus* is the same, though Justinus does not have *vicissim* with the reflexive. Combinations of *velut* and *quasi* with *quidam* are of frequent occurrence in Justinus, Florus and Apuleius, though as freely used by some other writers. Of adjectives not freely used may be given *inxpribilis*, *infantilis*, and *insatiabilis*. *Perpes* and *pervigil* have the same associations, as also *venerabilis*: Just. 42, 3, 5 v. *nomen* (Alexandri); Apul. Met. 3, 29, 231 v. *principis n.* *Aliquantisper, qualitercumque* and *vix . . . aegre* are limited to a few writers, and for that reason are not least in importance in a discussion of the relations of Justinus. However, he has the last words separated in 9, 7, 6 *vix . . . mitigatus est . . . aegre compulsus*, while other writers have them connected, usually by *et*; see Archiv 7, 467. Justinus and Apuleius have *ferme*, while *simul* with a connective has not infrequently lost its temporal force. Notice Just. 6, 3, 6 *gloriam*

diversis artibus quam priores duces consecuturus; and *Florus* 2, 2, 24 diversa quam hostis mandaverat censuit.

There are a few points of interest in the prepositional usage. The use of *ad instar* seems to link *Justinus* with the age of *Apuleius*, and *ad postremum*, which is characteristic of *Justinus*, occurs also a few times in *Apuleius*. *Apud* in local connections, though used in this way a few times by *Justinus*, is not as fully developed as in *Florus*, who has it in some passages where *Livy* uses *ad*. The original local association of *pone* is retained in *Just.* 7, 2, 8. *Apuleius* is freest in the use of the word, and has it six times with *terga*, while *Justinus* has in 1, 6, 11 *post terga*. *Justinus* has *usque* with both *ad* and *in*, and without either, and in both temporal and local relations, e. g. 33, 2, 6 *Persen*; 1, 1, 6 *Aegyptum*; 42, 2, 8 a *Cappadocia usque mare Caspium*. On the basis of this usage Wölfflin, *Archiv* 4, 55, maintains that *Justinus* must be placed after *Tacitus* and *Suetonius*, and adds "Da nun die christliche Litteratur, wie wir gleich zeigen werden, die Zurückhaltung des *Tacitus* und *Sueton* nicht teilt, so wird man geneigt sein den *Justin* in der Christengemeinde zu suchen". Here may belong *Just.* 5, 8, 5 *Piraeum versus*; *Apul.* *Met.* 9, 21, 632 *forum v.*; 10, 13, 700; and 11, 26, 809 *Romam v.*

The particles in *Justinus* present some interesting features. Noticeable among them is *atque ita*, which occurs nearly three score times, as in 2, 4, 25 *Hercules . . . pretium . . . accepit*. *Atque ita functus imperio ad regem revertitur*; 12, 12, 4 *ait . . . crediturum*. *Atque ita iuvenes . . . legit*; 43, 4, 9 *ille rem . . . defert*; *atque ita . . . comprehenduntur*. There are occasional instances in *Florus*, e. g. 2, 12, 3 *Thracas in res suas traxerant, atque ita industriam . . . temperavere*; 4, 10, 5 *sic quoque hostem fortasse non defore*. *Atque ita secuta est minor vis hostium*. In *Arnobius* there are at least seven occurrences, and here and there one in *Tertullian*. *Forsitan*, with adjective or noun, is found in *Just.* 4, 5, 3 *graviora et forsitan felicia bella*; 24, 7, 3 *et animos hostibus, forsitan et auxilia accessura*; and in *Apul.* *Met.* 7, 21, 488 *lites atque iurgia immo forsitan et crimina pariet*. *Igitur*, resuming the narrative after a suspension, is found in *Justinus* and *Florus*, as in *Just.* 11, 7, 14 *post hunc filius Mida regnavit . . . Igitur Alexander . . . requisivit*. *Mithridates* is mentioned in 42, 3, 2, and then chapter 4, 1 continues, *igitur M.*; *Florus* 1, 1, 4 *cuius ex filia Romulus*.

Igitur prima iuventutis face patrum deturbat; 1, 4, 1 Ancus deinde Marcius . . . igitur et muro moenia amplexus est; 2, 6, 2 puer Hannibal . . . iuraverat, nec morabatur. Igitur in causam belli Saguntos electa est. In Just. 15, 1, 8 additis insuper muneribus; and 24, 4, 9 addita insuper contumelia, *insuper* is placed within the parts of an ablative absolute, as in *Florus* 1, 18, 6 addito i. ferarum terrore; cf. 1, 13, 17; 2, 2, 17; *Apul. Met.* 7, 18, 481; see *Archiv* 5, 355. *Desuper* in Just. 21, 6, 6 vacua d. cera inducta, is similar to *Florus* 2, 6, 6 rogum, tum d. se suosque . . . corrumptunt; 3, 2, 6 turres, et d. . . . tropaea fixerunt. *Pariter* like *simul* is used by Justinus and Apuleius merely to strengthen the connective, as in Just. 1, 10, 20; 25, 1, 8 opes p. et neglegentiam; 9, 8, 8 blandus p. et insidiosus; 28, 4, 7 suo p. et hostium cruento; 12, 11, 2 exactio p. ac solutio; 38, 8, 11 sorori p. ac patriae; *Apul. Met.* 2, 15, 124 mari p. ac terrae; Just. 8, 1, 3 victos p. victoresque. *Prorsus* is one of the favorites of Justinus, and is used in three connections; a. with adjectives; b. with *ut*; and c. with *quasi*. a. In Justinus *prorsus* follows the adjective, as in 8, 2, 11; and 12, 3, 11 immemor p. Apuleius also uses the word freely, as in *Met.* 1, 23, 71 deque hac virginali p. verecundia. b. *Prorsus ut* with a consecutive clause comes next in frequency, in four out of the seven occurrences with some form of *videre*, as also in the three instances in *Florus*. *Incertum sit* is used in Just. 2, 1, 4; and 24, 6, 7; see *Archiv* 4, 619. In Apuleius the statement is comparative in *Met.* 9, 14, 620 *prorsus ut* in . . . latrinam. c. *Prorsus* occurs with *quasi* half a dozen times in Justinus, and occasionally in Apuleius: *Met.* 8, 27, 582; 9, 9, 611 p. q. possent tanti facinoris evadere supplicium. In common with Suetonius, both Justinus and Apuleius use *sed et*; see *Draeger* 2, 110.

3. The educational aim of Justinus was realized, for, as we have seen, his abbreviation supplanted the original work of Trogus. The suggestion for the work may have come from that of *Florus*. If so he intended to put the work of Trogus on a level with that of *Livy*, so far as it could be done by means of an *Epitome*. If this assumption is a valid one, it is an added indication that Justinus was an African, and that he had been subject to the influence of *Florus*, not necessarily as a pupil, but at least through his school training. While we may assume a connection between Justinus and *Florus*, we may also assume

that there was none between Florus and Fronto. The basis for this is the account of the rings carried to Carthage after the battle of Cannae. We find in Livy 23, 12, 1 effundi in vestibulo curiae iussit anulos aureos, qui tantus acervus fuit, ut metientibus supra tris modios explesse sint quidam auctores; fama tenuit, quae propior vero est, haud plus fuisse modio. The *equites* are mentioned later in the account. The least amount is accepted in Per. 23 anulos aureos corporibus occisorum detractos, in vestibulo curiae effudit, quos excessisse modii mensuram traditur. Florus gives a slightly different account 2, 6, 18 modii duo anulorum Carthaginem missi dignitasque equestris taxata mensura. The statement of the *quidam auctores* is accepted by Val. Max. 7, 2, Ext. 16 Magone . . . anulos aureos trium modiorum mensuram explentes fundente, qui interfectis nostris civibus detracti erant; and the latter is repeated by Fronto, p. 220 N., anulorum aureorum, quos caesis equitibus Romanis Poeni detraxerant, tres modios cumulatos misit Carthaginem. It is equally clear that neither Fronto nor Gellius were familiar with Justinus nor with Seneca. Gellius in 19, 8 tells how Fronto corrected a friend of his, a *bene eruditus homo et tum poeta industris*, who had been healed *quod 'harenis calentibus' esset usus*. The chapter ends with the words harenas . . . praeter C. Caesarem, quod equidem meminerim, nemo id doctorum hominum dedit. Yet Seneca uses it, as in D. 6, 18, 6; Ep. 55, 2; and 115, 8, and *moles harenarum* is found in Just. 1, 9, 3; 4, 1, 6; 15, 3, 11. This apparent disregard of the diction of Seneca suggests a new line of approach for the study of Justinus.

Seneca was subject to the cutting sarcasm of Caligula (Suet. Cal. 53), was criticised by Quintilian (10, 1, 125-131), and carped at by Fronto (p. 155-6 N.) and Gellius (12, 2). Tacitus indicates only the position of Seneca, in Ann. 12, 8, 9 ob claritudinem studiorum eius, while Suet. Nero 52 does not highly commend him: a philosophia eum mater avertit . . . a cognitione veterum oratorum Seneca praceptor, quo diutius in admiratione sui detineret. With the tide of criticism setting in so strong against him it is not strange that he seems to have dropped out of sight at Rome, and that Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius who were philosophically akin to him do not mention his name at all. But in Africa it was far different. By the

time of Tertullian, born about 160 A. D., the place of Seneca among the Christians was secure, for Tertullian says of him in *de Anima* 20, introducing a quotation from *Sen. de Benef.*, *Seneca saepe noster*. In *Apol.* 50 he also mentions *In Fortuitis*, and in sec. 42, and in *de Res. Carnis* 1 he refers to the *Troades*. Augustine, *de Civ. Dei* 6, 10 and 11, almost claims Seneca as an ally *adfuit enim scribenti, viventi defuit*. In the *Confessiones* 5, 6, 11 he places Tullius and Seneca in the same category. In passing we might say that his mention of Madaura (2, 3, 5) suggests the possibility that Seneca was taught in the school at that place, and so was well known to Apuleius. Midway between Tertullian and Augustine a free use of Seneca was made by Lactantius. The above indicates the close connection of the works of Seneca with African instruction, and suggests that he, rejected by the Roman rhetoricians, had become the corner of the instruction in Africa.

The extent and the strength of the opposition to Seneca at Rome evidences his influence in bringing into the current of Latin expression modifications of the phraseology of Cicero. This will be the more clear if we consider that the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* is a protest against the spirit of the work of Seneca. But between the age of Seneca and that of the Antonines came the Plinies, Quintilian, Suetonius and Tacitus, and if an element is found in any two of these it can not be told from which of the two it came to African Latinity, even if it came from either. Yet considering that Seneca was recognized as an educational force by the African Christians, the appearance of elements common to him and to the Africans at least shows the possibility of the influence of Seneca, through the use of his works in schools such as that at Madaura. As illustrations of this possibility we shall give a few words. *Dignus* with the infinitive is not in *Vell. Patrc.*, *Suetonius* and *Tacitus*; but occurs in *Seneca*, *Quintilian*, *Gellius* and *Apuleius*, while the same construction with *dedignari* is found in *Seneca*, the *Annals of Tacitus*, and *Justinus*. The inf. with *impero*, starting with *Seneca*, is found in *Justinus* as is *praecipere* also, and both the verbs are freely so used by *Suetonius*. It is not too much to assume that in the case of these words it was the usage of Seneca which influenced the African writers. But in the use of *vix et aegre* there is no intermediary for they occur in *Sen. Ep.* 118, 17;

Florus 2, 10, 3; Apul. Met. 1, 19, 63; and in 1, 14, 52 vix tandem et aegerrime; Arnobius 3, 11 aegre atque aegerrime: and in Just. 9, 7, 6 vix . . . aegre. Draeger 1, 327, 7, under the imperatives of deponents with middle meaning, quotes only Sen. N. Q. 4 Praef. 5 formare "*bilde dich*"; Apul. Met. 1, 19, 62 explere latice fontis lacteo "*trinke dich satt*"; and 11, 29, 816 rursum sacris initiare "*lass dich weihen*". Also at 1, 334 are quoted from Seneca and Apuleius examples of direct questions where the indirect might be expected. Seneca has in Ep. 12, 1 inter manus, which is also found in several passages in Apuleius. *Alternis* is used ten times by Seneca, as in Ep. 120, 19 *al. . . al.*; and by Just. in 2, 4, 12 *vicibus . . . al.*, while Apuleius has *alterna* in Met. 10, 17, 710. Sen., Ep. 1, 2; and D. 10, 9, 1, has pendet ex *crastino*, and Apuleius, *crastino* in Met. in 2, 11, 116; 6, 31, 444. Florus has in 2, 17, 11 *opima* without *spolia*, as also Sen. in Herc. Fur. 48. There are a few points in the prepositional usage in which Seneca agrees as well as disagrees with the African writers. *Ex causal* is found in Sen. Ep. 12, 9; Just. 3, 2, 4; and Apul. Met. 1, 2, 11. Florus has in 2, 3, 4 *ex occasione* the same as Seneca and Suetonius. Livy has the phrase, but we should expect in Florus the more common form *per o.* The usage with *obtentu* and *titulo* is not the same, as Seneca has *sub titulo*, and Justinus *sub obtentu*. The following are given as points of agreement: Sen. D. 9, 2, 5 *ex quo agnoscet quisque partem suam*; Just. 33, 2, 8 in patriam suam quisque remissus est; cf. Florus 1, 13, 10; 4, 2, 12; B. 7, 19, 8 in ore parentum liberos iugulat: Just. 31, 2, 3 in oculis observari. They also agree in the use of *inexplibilis*, *contremisco* with the accusative, and of *compesco* which is freely used by Seneca instead of *comprimo*. *Calco* used in a metaphorical sense is characteristic of Seneca, while *desaevio*, chiefly poetical, occurs in Sen. Ep. 15, 8; and D. 5, 1, 1 dum tempestas prima desaevit. The latter finds a parallel in Florus 2, 6, 12 secunda Punici belli procella desaevit. *Nec non et* for which Kübler (Archiv 8, 181) and Lease (Archiv 10, 390) furnish lists, is not unknown to Seneca: B. 5, 20, 5 *quod ipse praestare voluisset nec non et debuisset*.

The greater freedom of Apuleius and his extension of the use of the *quod*-clause instead of the subject acc. with the infinitive, lead us to place Justinus before the time of Apuleius.

At the same time there are two passages which Apuleius might easily have selected from Justinus for his own use in his own way. The first of these is Met. 10, 31, 741 *si sibi praemium . . . addixisset, et sese regnum totius Asiae tributuram*, the promise of Venus to the Trojan Alexander, while Just. 11, 7, 4 *nexus si quis solvisset, eum tota Asia regnaturum*, found its fulfilment in the Grecian Alexander. Apuleius writes in Met. 1, 2, 11 *postquam ardua montium et lubrica vallium et roscida cespitum et glebosa camporum emensi*. Justinus has in 41, 1, 11 *ut non immensa tantum ac profunda camporum, verum etiam praerupta collium montiumque ardua occupaverint*. The position and arrangement of *ardua montium*, the change in connectives, the lack of differentiation in *immensa . . . profunda*, and in *cespitem . . . camporum*, make one passage seem the rhetorical development of the other. Seneca has *blandimentum* and *inritamentum* several times, as in Ep. 51, 5 i. *vitiorum . . . b. voluptatum*, but in D. 5, 9, 2 *lituos et tubas concitamenta esse, sicut quosdam cantus blandimenta*. Justinus has in 31, 7, 9 *belli ea inritamenta, non pacis blandimenta esse*; and Apul. de Magia 98, 593 *blandimentis . . . illectamentis*. The words *concitamenta* and *illectamenta* are unusual, but the reversal of the order of the terms by Apuleius at least suggests the words of Justinus as the basis of his own. If these assumptions are valid, then the position assigned to Justinus after Fronto on the basis of the usage with *ad instar* is not tenable; see Archiv 2, 590 "Auch beweist die Stelle von *ad instar* bei Justin 36, 3, 2 . . . dass der Epitomator nach Fronto gesetzt werden muss."

If the development of Latin were along one line only the usage with *usque* and *ad instar* would seem to place Justinus after Fronto. But Seneca has *instar* in Thyest. 873 *fluminis*; D. 12, 1, 4 *consolationis*; and in Ep. 61, 1 *vitae*. See also in Ep. 53, 1 a *Parthenope tua usque Puteolos*. The usage with both terms in Seneca is as near to that of Justinus as is the usage of Fronto, and if Justinus had studied Seneca, the step from *usque ad* to *usque*, and from *instar* to *ad instar* would be as easy for a student follower of Seneca, as it would be for a historical follower of Fronto. The testimony of Servius, ad Aen. 6, 685 *ad instar enim non dicimus*, indicates that to him the African usage was unknown; and we maintain that the witnesses brought forward do not prove that Justinus wrote later than Fronto.

In his vocabulary Fronto has little of note that is used by Justinus. *Pernicitas, huiuscemodi, invicem se* and *tametsi . . . tamen* are the most noticeable. And the limited number of these make more important some passages in the letters written in 144 A. D., ad M. Caesarem, IV, p. 58 foll. N.

It is interesting to note that although *advena* occurs in Just. 2, 1, 6; 2, 5, 3; and 2, 6, 4 *quippe non advena neque passim populi conlувies originem urbi dedit, convena* occurs only in 38, 7, 1 *clariorem illa conlувie convenarum*, as in Fronto, p. 58 N., *diversis nationibus convenae variis moribus inbuti*. The phraseology in Fronto, p. 63 N., *caput atque fons Romanae facundiae*, is varied in Just. 13, 6, 11 *ad ipsum fontem et caput regni*; Arnobius 2, 2; and Lactantius 5, 14, 11; and there is a further variation in Gellius 10, 20, 7 *caput ipsum et origo et quasi fons*; cf. Florus 3, 6, 12 in o. *fontemque belli*. It should be noticed that Justinus has *causa et origo* in earlier passages 1, 7, 2; 3, 4, 2; 8, 1, 4; and 11, 7, 5, and that the same combination is used by Apuleius and Arnobius; see p. 32. We find in Fronto, p. 59 N., *ut amicos ac sectatores suos amore inter se mutuo copularet*. Compare with this Just. 26, 1, 3 *aut . . . societatem iungebant aut mutuis inter se odiis in bellum ruebant*. This is the sole instance of *m. inter se* in Just., and though he does not have *copulo*, he has *iungo* in one part of his statement, and, in the other, reverses the order of the noun and adjective as used by Fronto. In Florus 4, 2, 33; Apul. de Mundo 5, 297; and Dogm. Plat. 1, 11, 203 *inter se* is not inclosed between adjective and noun. Just. has in 41, 4, 4 *dum invicem eripere sibi regnum volunt*; and Fronto, p. 59 N., *invideant i. amici tui sibi*. The separation of *invicem* and *sibi* is the same in both, and in addition, these are the only passages in the two writers in which *invicem* is used with *sibi*. The use of *convena* instead of the earlier *advena*; of *fons et caput* instead of the earlier *causa et origo*, and varying from Fronto's *c. atque f.*; of *mutuis inter se odiis*, a variation of *amore inter se mutuo*; and of *invicem . . . sibi* indicates a complimentary use of two letters of the ex-consul, about a year after his consulship. If the above conclusions are valid the date for Justinus is 144 or 145 A. D.

Let us summarize the conclusions to which we have come. The absence of any mention of Sertorius who was so closely connected with the history of the family indicates that Trogus

considered the account of Livy entirely adequate, and that he wrote after Books 90-96 of Livy dealing with the Sertorian war were published. The date of publication is more definitely shown by the adaptation of a line from the first book of *Phaedrus*. Stylistic resemblances show that Justinus was an African, and his own statements fix his date between the reign of Hadrian and 226 A. D. But it is probable that he was influenced by the writings of Seneca, and for this reason his use of *ad instar* and *usque* do not have any weight in fixing his date after Fronto. On the other hand the more restricted usage of Justinus at certain points renders it probable that he came before Apuleius, and this view is strengthened by the apparent rhetorical development by Apuleius of two statements in Justinus. There is no indication of any connection between Florus and Fronto, although from the work of the former may have come the suggestion for the work of Justinus. But there are four pieces of phraseology in Justinus apparently directly based on the words of Fronto found in two letters written in 144 A. D. And these seem to fix definitely the date of the sojourn of Justinus at Rome and the preparation of his work in 144 or 145 A. D.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

III.—PAULUS SILENTIARIUS.

PART I.

As part of an appalling task, the translation of the entire Greek Anthology into Italian verse—‘quell’eterno mio lavoro’ he calls it ‘cui non so se condurrò mai a fine’—Professor Alessandro Veniero of Catania, the Aitna of Pindar, the coquettish city of Bellini, has undertaken to do for Paulus Silentarius what others have done and more than others have done for other anthologists. Meleager, Krinagoras and Palladas have called forth noteworthy monographs. Why should not the author of epigrams ‘remarkable for their wit, their grace, their elegance’, a poet who rose far above the level of his contemporaries, happy rival of Alexandrian masters, singer of the great church of St. Sophia and its Pulpit, why should not Paulus have a volume dedicated to him, a volume which should serve to vindicate the favourable judgment of Jacobs and Bernhardy and Croiset? Professor Veniero’s book with its introduction, its translations, its notes has interested me and, as is my inveterate habit (A. J. P. XXXIV 240), I have made a summary of it for my own amusement. Much, indeed by far the greatest part, of this kind of work has been consigned to the columbarium that holds most of my writings, but I am going to make an exception in favour, if it is in favour, of Professor Veniero’s *Paolo Silenzario—Studio della letteratura bizantina del VI secolo*, and call in others to accompany me on my winding way through the book.

Doubtless Professor Veniero will be shocked at the liberties I have taken with my text, at my frivolities, my intercalated reflexions, my style, that style which gave so much offence to such superior persons as the late Arthur Woolgar Verrall (A. J. P. XXVI 115). But criticism and anticriticism alike matter little to a man who in the course of nature is ripening for the *ἐπιτρόμβια* section of the Anthology. No one who has cheerfully survived being called by a German well-wisher the Mark Twain of Greek syntax and by an Irish ill-wisher, the fabricator of a Pindaric ‘nostrum’, has anything more to

dread. But whatever Professor Veniero may think of form or content of these pages, he may congratulate himself on finding a summarist who makes due allowance for the astounding plenitude of typographical errors. The best Italian compositors, as I have learned from other sources, have exchanged the 'shooting-sticks' of their own trade for the 'shooting-irons' of another on the banks of the Isonzo.

This is not a 'review by a specialist' for I have no special equipment for the study of Paulus. Sixty-two years ago in my first published review article I made an erudite reference to the poet who 'hymned the Pulpit', but at that date I had not read a line of Paulus, and now after the lapse of all these years I am simply going to deepen my slight impressions of the Byzantine epigrammatist as gained from holiday excursions in the Anthology. With Professor Veniero's essay on Paulus' Description of the Church of St. Sophia and the Pulpit, I shall not meddle. Twenty years ago I stood under the dome of the great Djami and thought of Paulus among other things and wondered whether it was true that the musk with which the mortar was tempered retained its virtue as it was fabled to do. But the scowling Moslems would not have suffered me to try, and I must limit myself to the question how far the delicate fragrance of Alexandria has held its own against the heavier perfume of Byzantium.

Professor Veniero's first chapter deals with the Life of Paulus. Paulus the Silentiary was the son of Cyrus, the grandson of Florus. The name Cyrus gives us pause. It has a religious significance, and old-fashioned Presbyterians who would not have dreamed of calling their children by the name of Messiah, and were shocked at the profane use of Jesus by the Spaniards, did not hesitate to give their boys the name of the Lord's anointed Cyrus in baptism. Perhaps some Byzantine scholar will throw light upon the point.¹ Florus is decidedly pagan, and it might be possible to moralize the two names. Paulus was born towards the close of the fifth century and lived to what, in spite of Metchnikoff, we must still call a good old age,

¹ Among the Christian epigrams there is one addressed to a certain Cyrus, a martyr: Κύρῳ ἀκεστορόης πανυπέρτατα μέτρα λαχόντι, A. P. I 90.

dying in 575 A. D.—I am careful to add A. D. mindful of the weakness of other Italian scholars (A. J. P. XXIII 446; cf. XXXII 240) and of Johnson's Cyclopaedia s. v. Lucian where B. C. stands instead of A. D. Paulus belonged to a rich and aristocratic family and Stadtmüller thinks that his daughter who bore the frightful and ominous name Aniketeia married Agathias who also figures in the Anthology. If I were like Otto who in his edition of the Epistle to Diognetus (A. J. P. XXXI 366) treats us to a long list of Diogneti from whom his Diognetus is to be distinguished, I might caution the reader against confounding Paulus Silentarius with Paul of Tarsus, no tinkling cymbal like his Byzantine namesake. But this Paulus is hardly ever cited without his addition. But what that addition means puzzles the best will of the archaeologist. The variety and futility of Byzantine functionaries have been touched on in my Essay on the Emperor Julian, in which, if I had been a really learned man, I might have paraded a formidable array of titles gathered from one Nicephorus, not to be confounded with half a dozen other Nicephori. The only thing real about most of these offices was the pay, if even that was real. The office of Silentarius is sometimes identified with that of Gentleman of the Bedchamber, sometimes with that of Master of Ceremonies. The Master of Ceremonies was naturally the man who commanded silence on state occasions as did the herald of classical times with his εὐφημεῖν χρῆ. On this theory the silentiary was a manner of head-usher, and this very word 'usher' (*ostiarius*) reminds me of a noted jurist, who misled by that cheating jade Popular Etymology (A. J. P. XXXVII 368) insisted, despite protest, on identifying 'usher' with a cockney 'husher', a fair translation of Silentarius. Paul Husher has, indeed, the signal advantages of brevity and idiomatic force over Paulus Silentarius, but the mouth-filling name has stood Paulus in good stead during the centuries.

The next chapter deals with the age of Justinian in its relation to literature. Instead of sowing the lower margin of the book with references our author contents himself with a general bibliography. The list comprises Bernhardy, Bergk ('assai povera'), Christ, Krumbacher, Gibbon, Victor Schulze, Raffaele Mariano, Diehl, Boissier, Nicola Turchi, and Bikélas. In the

presence of such a display of authorities it behooves me to walk softly in the tracks of Professor Veniero.¹

In assigning limits to the period he undertakes to discuss, Professor Veniero follows Krumbacher, and his outline extends from the overlordship of Constantine (324) to the death of Heraclius (641) <both A. D. >. The Greco-Byzantine Empire, he says, continues the Roman Empire, but is pervaded by a new element, Christianity, and combines the wisdom of the Roman constitution with the luxury of the Orient. Justinian is the natural successor of Augustus. Constantinople is Rome by the sea. There is a new development of art based on Greek literature from Homer to Kallimachos and as Roman literature though based on Greek literature is a literature by itself (comp. Leo, A. J. P. XXV 480) so it may well be maintained that Byzantine literature, though an imitation of the Greek, is a literature apart. Byzantine literature is characterized by the contrast between the old form and the new principle, between the vision of the greatness of Rome and the actual reign of Christ. The definitive triumph of Christianity over paganism is signified by the Church of St. Sophia in which the genius of Rome and the genius of Christianity are blended.

The Fathers of the Church did not hesitate to acknowledge their indebtedness to pagan literature. With St. Jerome they cut off the head of the heathen Goliath with his own sword. With St. Augustin they rejoiced in spoiling the pagans as the children of Israel spoiled the Egyptians. St. Basil wrote a famous treatise, perhaps oftener reprinted in modern times than almost any single patristic discourse, on the use that Christian youths are to make of Gentile literature. He was as much enamoured of Plato as was his contemporary Julian, and his obligations to Plato have been set forth in a Johns Hopkins dissertation by Dr. Shear. The old rhetoric held its own, as we all know from Walz, to whose collection I owe my acquaintance with a Christian writer who bore the remarkable surname of Rhakendytes. The figures of the Greek Pantheon kept up a literary life as they still do even among us. The Greek Kallone became a handmaiden to serve the Christ. The bust of the

¹ Professor Veniero does not cite—how could he?—Professor Vance's 'Byzantinische Culturgeschichte' based on the study of Chrysostom, an interesting document (A. J. P. XXXII 118).

Redeemer was draped with the philosopher's robe. The monster that threatened to devour Andromeda became the fish that swallowed Jonah. The chariot of Pluto that took Persephone to Hades was made over by the Christian wainwright into the chariot that conveys Elijah to heaven. The surnames of Aphrodite, that arch she-devil of Heine, were hypostasized into the she-saints of the Bollandists as Usener has shewn and the Passion of Our Saviour was set forth in a cento of Euripidean verses—a cento fathered on Gregory of Nazianzus—which adheres to the origin so closely that it has been used to correct the Euripidean text. Then it must be remembered that paganism, not literary paganism only, but the genuine article was not dead. The worship of Isis remained undisturbed in Egypt. Indeed I have known Isis to be used in America as a girl's name and of late years a like honour has been paid to Ishtar. The ancient rites were still observed. There were many half-baked Christians who sorely needed the fires of persecution to make them vessels of honour. The ancient faith had its martyrs. Statues of gods and goddesses abounded in Constantinople, and an image of Venus had the remarkable property of testing the chastity of those who appeared before it, and putting to shame the guilty by the exposure of that wherewith they had sinned. And as for literature, the language, the imagery continued to be the language and imagery of what we still call by eminence, classic times. No wonder that this state of things is reflected in the most characteristic form of pagan poetry, the epigram; so that we reach a natural point of transition to Professor Veniero's third and most important chapter.

This third chapter deals ostensibly with the Epigrams and the Epigrammatists of the Sixth Century, but Veniero takes in the whole period during which the old form was adapted to the new life. Christianity had its ἀναθηματικά as well as its ἐπιτύμβια, ἐπιδεικτικά, προτρηπτικά. The statue of St. Michael takes the place of the statue of Hercules; for, in the time of Paulus, we are far from the period of the iconoclasts, but the admission of statues into churches was still a moot point, and as a moot point it was handled in the epigram; and the destruction of the pagan temples was another theme.

Christian poetry transformed the sepulchral and the protreptic epigram, but who wants to read fifty-two epigrams on the

blessedness of giving up the ghost in church, and thus exchanging a temporary slumber for the eternal sleep? Who wants to read a long string of epigrams by Gregory the Theologian in which all manner of curses, Christian and pagan, are invoked upon the heads of grave-robbers? There are floating bits of scandal, such as we find in the epigram of Agathias (A. P. VII 572) on a secret adulterer upon whom a roof fell, burying him and his partner in guilt. Mocking epigrams there are, levelled at those in the highest places, laments over the victims of such monsters as Phocas. But the trouble is that so many of the epigrams have no root in actuality. 'Clouds without water', as St. Jude hath it, 'carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots'. They are mere rhetorical exercises. Who were Apollo and Hermes and Pan to a Byzantine Christian that he should dedicate anything to them? No more than they are to you and to me, and yet in a recent number of the JOURNAL, I proposed with a Byzantine epigram before me to dedicate the instruments of my former trade to Hermes Logios (A. J. P. XXXVII 232). Such is the persistency of the classic machinery. In those Byzantine epigrams we haven't to do with real feeling—except perhaps when the epigrammatist is worried with the refractoriness of proper names—as is shewn in the varying quantity of *Βασιλεύς* which appears now as ˘ ˘ — ˘, now as — ˘ ˘ ˘.¹ To be sure, Veniero calls upon us to admire 'the mastery of the form, the ingenuity of the figures', an ingenuity which hovers between 'supersubtlety' and 'supersilliness', between Mommesen's 'verwünscht gescheidt' and his 'herzlich albern', A. J. P. XXXV 492 fn. He calls upon us to admire the novelty of the words and stirs questions as to the manufacture of compounds at this late day (A. J. P. XXXVII 237). He calls upon us to applaud the accuracy with which Paulus describes objects of everyday life, an art in which he cannot attain to Leonidas of Tarentum, and the wonderful variety of the three epigrams in which the same epigrammatist dedicates the implements of the scrivener's trade to paper deities. And yet we are told in the same breath that 'the creative vein dries up more and more, that there is at best nothing but a rhetorical amplification of old themes, elegant imitations of earlier poets, cumbrous mythologi-

¹ See A. P. VIII (Gregory the Theologian), 2, 2; 3, 1; 4, 3; 5, 2 al.

cal erudition'—not true of Paulus, Signor Veniero—'and meticulous pretiosities'.

One begins to wonder after this indictment why Veniero should have persevered in his studies. But we cease to wonder when we come to the erotic elegy. We raise again the Sophoclean chant *Ἐρως ἀνίκατε μάχαν* without any Euripidean reserves. What Freud says of dreams (A. J. P. XXXII 478) is true of this dream of a shadow we call life. In the erotic epigrams of the period, we feel every now and then something more genuine than a literary aphrodisiac; and to adapt a figure of Veniero's the Byzantine poet attires himself in the cast-off clothes of his predecessors in order to express a true feeling, serenading, as it were, after a masked ball in hired frippery a sweetheart of flesh and blood.

There is one side of love, however, and that the most characteristic of the antique, the great theme of Plato's Symposium, the *Μούσα παιδική*, that is shunned by the Byzantine Paulus as it is denounced by the Apostle Paul. In the Byzantine *έρωτικά* this form of love is mentioned only to be scouted, as it is by Agathias in his Praise of Marriage, V 302, 7:

*μούχια λέκτρα κάκιστα, καὶ ἐκτοθέν εἰσιν ἐρέτων,
ὅν μέτα παιδομανῆς κείσθω ἀλιτροσύνη.*

Agathias is a sympathetic soul and his supposed connection with Paulus adds a curious interest to his epigrams. There are 252 epigrams in the twelfth section of the Anthologia Palatina as against 309 *έρωτικά*. It holds some of the best work, artistically speaking, of some of the best anthologists, and Mr. Mackail has not hesitated to draw upon its stores.¹ Straton, who takes his stand on the intellectual eminence of this form of love XII 245:

*οἱ λογικοὶ δὲ
τῶν δλλων ζέφων τοῦτ' ἔχομεν τὸ πλέον.*

turns his back upon the ladies of Helikon because they are mere women, and proceeds to draw up a bill of fare for travellers in this region of the Pays du Tendre; and in a number of the epigrams there are details untranslatable. But leaving out Straton,

¹ However, whereas one-fourth of the *έρωτικά* has passed into his Select Epigrams, only some 13 per cent of the epigrams of A. P. XII have found favor with him.

he who seeks ' raciness ' in this corner of the garden will be only less disappointed than those who should be tempted by the title to read the *έταιρικοι δάλογοι* of Lucian (Essays and Studies, p. 344). They would fare as did the yokel who was taken in by the superscription of Young's Night Thoughts (A. J. P. XX 350). *ἡγρεύθην*, says the unknown author of XII 99:

*ἡγρεύθην. ἀλλ' οὐ με κακῶν πόθος, ἀλλ' ἀκέραιος
σύντροφον αἰσχύνη βλέμμα κατηνθράκισεν.*

It is a delicate subject and though this is a technical journal and not intended for the run of readers, I have been warned against further exposure of Browning's indecencies, and dare not ask whether St. Paul's limitation to what he bluntly calls *ἡ φυσικὴ χρῆσις τῆς θηλείας* has in view the abuse of *τὰ τρία τρυπήματα* (V 49; VI 17). That is a question that belongs to the underground laboratory of Gibbon's notes. Doubtless there was as much licence in Byzantium and as much hypocrisy as in our day. There are deep trenches in modern life—fitly called ' boyaux ' in France,—that are now and then exposed to the light of day by the artillery of the press as happened some years ago in Berlin. The ghost of Oscar Wilde still walks the earth, not unaccompanied by shades that have figured in modern annals of literary bardashery, but let us hope that boys will continue to read about ' Pastor Corydon ' and ' formosus Alexis ' without taking harm just as the pure-minded Emerson and his innocent editor read to their edification the ' odes ' of Martial in praise of self-help,¹ little suspecting what was meant by Martial's handy substitute for Ganymede (A. J. P. XXXIV 241).

To come back to Veniero, the condition of women was not improved by the transfer of the seat of the Empire to Byzantium. Read Agathias, V 297.² Women were not allowed to appear in public unveiled, though if the veils were such a flimsy, not to say barefaced, pretext as those that I beheld on a bankside

¹ II 43, 4: *At mihi succurrit pro Ganymede manus* (comp. VI 301, 22). Of course, there is the Schol. on Ap. Rhod. 3, 115, but Emerson did not familiarize himself with scholia as Browning did.

² V 297, 8 and 9:

*ἡμᾶς δ' οὐδὲ φάσι λεύσσειν θέμις, ἀλλὰ μελάθροις
κρυπτόμεθα ζοφεραῖς φροντίσι τηκόμεναι.*

at Scutari in 1896, not much was lost to the gaze of the curious. In church women were divided from men as they are still in many denominations even in America. The eunuch was the duenna then as he is now. But there was no lack of ear-tickling gossip, of intrigues, of amorous adventures, and Veniero specifies the love affairs of Theodosius with the wife of Belisarius, of the daughter of Belisarius with Anastasius.

Still, the little god of the Alexandrians had had his wings clipped. The commerce of the sexes was considered a fatal consequence of the fall, at best a necessary evil. Every reader of Sir Thomas Browne will remember how fully in sympathy he was with that view, how he refers with evident approval to the Rabbinical interpretation of the tree in the midst of the garden, how he uttered a 'melancholy Utinam' for a different method of maintaining the continuity of the race. To redeem matrimony, it was made a sacrament, and, as turn about is fair play, religious fervour adopted and still keeps up the language of human passion. In fact Sacred Love and Profane Love not only appear side by side as in Titian's picture, they anastomose as is set forth in Zola's *La Faute de l'abbé Mouret*, as is shown by the history of pilgrimages ancient and modern. But to Gregory of Nazianzus, profane love was a disease, a *γλυκεῖα νόσος*, as it was a *γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον δρπετον* to Sappho. *γλυκύπικρον*, by the way, has been credited by more than one scholar to Poseidippus. It is used by Meleager also. I doubt whether it was original even with Sappho, who knew all about it. The praise of virginity early intoned is still chanted, and it is not necessary to cite the hymns of the early church, and the consentient voices of the Fathers. Of course the famous text 'It is better to marry than to burn' was invoked from time to time, and there is the supreme consolation that if all were virgins there would be no virgins. What under these circumstances is to become of the erotic epigram, with its fierce sensuality, its coy dalliance? Well, life went on as before. Paganism was not rooted out, nor was human nature turned out of doors. Vice flourished with all its refinements in the Rome of the East, as it does in our Metropolis of the West, who prides herself on giving points to Paris. Pagan rites, pagan practices were winked at. The epithets of Venus may be hypostatized as we have seen and

turned into saints, but the cestus of the goddess peeps out from under the cassock of monk and philosopher alike. But we are warned not to think that the erotic poetry of Byzantium is a mere reconstruction, a mere return to the life of an overpast age. Under the vesture of a bygone time throbs the beat of a human heart. Gone is the mild enjoyment of the Alexandrians, the tempered breathing of the Epicurean *ἡδονή*. The forbidden fruit, says Veniero, a tropical writer, bears the print of the schoolboy's teeth, though our friend Paulus as we shall see prefers the tenderness of Demo's kiss to the incisiveness of Doris. Sharp is the bite of sexual passion. 'Lust hard by hate' as the Puritan poet tells us. 'Je t'aime, ah! je t'aime', as a poet of to-day has it, 'Je voudrais te faire du mal'. For fear of being too cold the Byzantine rakes up the fire of Tophet, and then again for fear of being too hot he makes a jest of his own pornographic details. So Rufinus, who is a ruffian, puts himself in the place of Paris and makes an ordnance map of the beauties of three hetaerae (A. P. V 35, 36) reminding one of Nevizan's thirty points of female physical perfection (A. J. P. XXXIV 489) reminding one of Alkiphron (I 39), and of that other heathen, Anatole France, in his *Jérôme Coignard*, p. 52. A parallel to Rufinus is found, as Veniero reminds us, in Nonnus, Dionys. XV 204, XLII 355. When, however, the poet allows himself to be guided by his own heart and his own taste, he succeeds in producing something graceful and artistic *θαυμαστόν τι καὶ πλῆρες χάριτος*, some madrigal addressed to some lady of Theodora's court, such as the famous V 270 to which we may

Οὐτε ῥόδον στεφάνων ἐπιδεύγεται, οὐτε σὸν πέπλων,
οὐτε λεθοβλήτων, πότνια, κεκρυφάλων.
μάργαρα σῆς χροῆς ἀπολείπεται, οὐδὲ κομίζει
χρυσὸς ἀπεκτήτου σῆς τριχὸς ἀγλατήν.
'Ινδψη δ' ὑάκινθος ἔχει χάριν αἰθοτος αἰγλῆς,
ἀλλὰ τεῶν λογάδων¹ πολλὸν ἀφαιροτέρην.
χείλεα δὲ δροσεντα, καὶ ἡ μελίφυρτος ἐκείνη²
ἥθεος ἀρμοκή, κεστὸς ἔφι Παφῆς.
τούτοις πᾶσιν ἔγω καταδάμναμαι· δύμασι μούνοις
θελγομαι, οἰς ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖλιχος ἐνδιάμε.

¹ λογάδων = eyes, but how or why? Salmasius' λοχάδων gives the image of eyes peering from an ambush, as a stone from its setting.

add further V 301, 241 and 254.¹ Such original creations, however, are rare. The inventive faculty has too little spring. It needs pressure from without. Now it is a proverb that is to be contradicted—proverbs are notoriously reversible cuffs. Now an Homeric reminiscence furnishes the suggestion, now a passage from an elegiac poet. The Byzantine poet draws from all he has read whether prose or poetry, not unlike Vergil in this, and succeeds here in reproducing the exquisite form, there in catching the sonorous phrase. An amusing contrast, says Veniero, is offered when the poet devoured by love betrays the homely reality as when Paulus, forgetful of the Ovidian 'Turpe senilis amor', reveals the fact that his head is grizzled. The epigram V 264² is one of the most noted of Paulus's fabrication, but I cannot agree with Veniero here. The same Ovid

V 301:

εἰ καὶ τηλοτέρω Μερόης τεδν ἵχνος ἐρείσει,
 πτηνὸς Ἐρωτικῆς κείσε μένει με φέρει·
 εἰ καὶ ἐς ἀντολήν πρὸς διμόχροον ἰξει Ἡώ,
 πεξὸς ἀμετρήτοις ἔψομαι ἐν σταδίοις.
 εἰ δέ τι σοι στέλλω βύθιον γέρας, ἐλαθί, κούρη,
 εἰς σὲ θαλασσαλή τούτο φέρει Παφίη,
 κάλλει τικθείσα τεοῦ χροδὸς ἱμερόεντος
 τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' ἀγγαῖη θάρσος ἀπωσαμένη.

V 241:

‘Σφέεο’ σοι μέλλων ἐνέπειν, παλίνορσον ιωὴν
 ἀψ ἀνασειράξω, καὶ πάλιν ἀγχι μένω·
 σὴν γὰρ ἐγώ δασπλῆτα διάστασιν ολά τε πικρὴν
 νύκτα καταπτήσω τὴν Ἀχεροντιάδα·
 ἥματι γὰρ σέο φέγγος δμοῖον· ἀλλὰ τὸ μέν που
 ἀφθογγον· σὸν δέ μοι καὶ τὸ λάλημα φέρεις,
 κείνο τὸ Σειρήνων γλυκερώτερον. ψὲπι πᾶσαι
 εἰσὶν ἐμῆς ψυχῆς ἀλπίδες ἐκκρεμέες.³

V 254:

‘Ωμοσα μιμνάζειν σέο τηλόθεν, ἀργέτι κούρη,
 ἄχρι δυωδεκάτης, ὁ πέποι, ἡριπόλης·
 οὐ δ' ἔτληρ δ τάλας· τὸ γὰρ αὔριον δμμι φαάνθη
 τηλοτέρω μήτης. ναὶ μὰ σέ, δωδεκάτης.
 ἀλλὰ θεός ικέτευε, φίλη, μὴ ταῦτα χαράξαι
 δρκια ποιναλης νῶτον ὑπερ σελίδος·
 θέλγε δὲ σαις χαρίτεσσιν ἐμῆν φρένα· μὴ δέ με μάστιξ,
 πότνια, κατασμύη καὶ σέο καὶ μακάρων.

¹ See p. 65.

² Son-in-law Agathias (p. 44) is also credited with this specimen.

says: 'Quae venit exacto tempore peius amat' and what is true of the 'quae' is true of the 'qui'. As a specimen of the way in which Paulus imitates his models, Veniero¹ takes V 279, another admired piece, a resetting, or, if you choose, an amplification of 'the sober and elegant' Asklepiades V 150.² The Alexandrian poet has waited all night sustained by a solemn promise, a promise fortified by an oath that has been given him by a famous beauty, a touch that heightens his jealousy. He is no Juvenalian lover, 'impatiens morae'. He reminds one rather of Horace in like case. He waits. The night watch passes by. Midnight has gone. The girl has simply fooled him. The poet is an Epicurean of the 'nil admirari' order—*Bien fol est qui s'y fie*—and bids his servants put out the light.³ The Byzantine poet, on the other hand, plunges 'in medias res'.⁴ We know nothing of the promise made by the famous beauty, whose popularity recalls Maupassant's 'Boule de Suif' and may well have given grounds for jealousy. The third watch, or rather the third wick, was consumed in waiting, waiting, all in vain. Instead of putting out the light and going to bed in philosophical loneliness, he utters a prayer that his love may be extinguished like the light of the lamp and with his love his sleepless desires. Then, and not till then, does he recall the oaths of Kleophantis and begin to moralize on her double faithlessness to men and to gods. Evidently Veniero does not believe in the sleepless desires of any man capable of such a conceit as that of the lamp in such circumstances, and I must grant that Paulus lays himself open to the suspicion of being what Stratton, the unquotable, irredeemable blackguard and monstrous

¹ I am translating V.'s inexact account of the situation and not the Greek.

² Πιολόγησ ήξειν εἰς νύκτα μοι ή πιβόητος
Νικώ καὶ σεμνὴν ὥμοσε Θεσμοφόρον·
κούχη ήκει, φυλακὴ δὲ παροίχεται. δρ' ἐπιορκεῖν
ήθελε; τὸν λύχνον, πτῖδες, ἀποσβέσατε.

³ Δηθύνει Κλεόφαντις· δε δὲ τρίτος δρχεται ήδη
λύχνος ὑποκλάσειν ἡκα μαρανθμένος.
αἴθε δε καὶ κραδίης πυρσὸς συναπέσθετο λύχνῳ,
μηδέ μ' ὑπ' ἀγρύπτων δηρδν ἔκαιε πόθοις.
δε πόσα τὴν Κυθέρειαν ἐπώμοσεν ἐσπερος ήξειν,
ἀλλ' οὔτ' ἀνθρώπων φείδεται, οὐτε θεῶν.

punster, would call an Astyanax—before the fact (XII 11, 4). In strained situations everyone is alive to impressions from without. Homer, as I have urged elsewhere (Creed of the Old South, pp. 9, 103), is psychologically correct and is not epically parenthetic when he mentions the washing-troughs in his description of Hektor's flight before the face of Achilles; but he does not moralize the troughs. Still, as the lamp, the lantern, is so regularly associated with love-scenes in the Anthology (e. g. V. 4, 5, 7, 165, 197, 263)—there is so much sympathy between light of wick and light of wickedness—I hesitate to join in Veniero's censure. What a difference, exclaims Veniero. The Alexandrian poet gives us a complete picture—the Byzantine a scrappy sketch. And yet, as I have said, this Kleophantis epigram is a prime favourite.

Still, continues Veniero, in spite of the lack of genuine inspiration Paulus knows how to adapt and develop, and one of these adaptations and developments is found in the epigram to which we owe the famous line 'Beauty draws us by a single hair'.¹ While then as compared with the poets of the third century B. C. Paulus falls below his models in feeling, in grace of form and happiness of phrase, he is far above his contemporaries. And if in V 270 already quoted (p. 51) and in V 260² the coloring is too high, the art, says Veniero, is exquisite and in VI 71³ under the guise of a dedicatory epigram, we have a vivid description of a revelry, that had taken place in a banquet-hall deserted. A favourite theme with the Alexandrian poets is what may be called the Ninon de l'Enclos or 'Femme de trente ans' movement—the charm that persists after the fatal acmé which Balzac fixed at thirty, and which has of late years been

¹V 230:

Χρυσῆς ειρύσσασα μιαν τρίχα Δωρὶς ἔθειρης,
ολα δορικτήτους δῆσεν ἐμεῦ ταλάμας·
αὐτῷ ἐγὼ τὸ πτύλον μὲν ἐκάγχασα, δεσμὰ τινάξαι
Δωρίδος ἱμερτῆς εὐμαρές οἰδημενος·
ώς δὲ διαρρήξαι σθέρος οὐκ ἔχον, ἔστενον ηδη,
ολά το χαλκείη σφρυγκτὸς ἀλυκτοπέδη.
καὶ νῦν δὲ τρισάποτος ἀπὸ τριχὸς ἡέρτημαι,
δεσπότις ἔνθ' ἔρυση, πυκνὰ μεθελκόμενος.

²See p. 62.

³See p. 58.

moved from Balzac's to Karin Michaelis' ' Dangerous Age ' ¹ which she considers forty. Asklepiades treats the theme with severe simplicity in VII 217, Philodemus develops it, anatomizes the object of his passion in detail and commends to those who seek for what Philodemus calls *όργωντας πόθος* and Veniero translates spicily ' pepati desiderii ' the accomplished artist with her highly favoured personality (A. J. P. XXXIV 231). We are in the region of Philainis (A. J. P. II 126 fn.). We are in the dangerous neighborhood of the Golden Ass. One recalls Benjamin Franklin's cynical advice to his son—half-suppressed by Bigelow and Kirby Smith's recent contribution to the exegesis of Tibullus (A. J. P. XXXVII 145). Veniero's epigram is more in the line of Burns' ' John Anderson, my Jo, John ' with the sexes reversed. The bonnie brow is no longer brent ; but the autumn and even winter of Philinna were better than the spring of others. We are next invited to compare Rufinus on the same subject, V 62, who goes into the same anatomical detail as does Philodemus, pays tribute to Matthew Arnold's Great Goddess Lubricity and winds up with a slavish imitation of Asklepiades. Finally we have Agathias V 289 with his detailed and tedious narrative, but I must leave the verification of these judgments of Veniero's to the reader, and content myself with giving the text of 258.

Πρόκριτός εστι, Φλιννα, τεὴ δύτις η ὀπὸς ἥβης
 πάσης· ἵμερο δ' αὐτοὶ ἔχειν παλάμαις
 μᾶλλον ἐγὼ σέο μῆλα καρηβαρέοντα κορύμβοις,
 η μαζὸν νεαρῆς ὄρθιον¹ ἡλικίης.
 σὸν γὰρ έτι φθινόπωρον ὑπέρτερον εἰλαρος ἀλλης,
 χείμα σὸν ἀλλοτρίον θερμότερορος θέρεος.

Beyond the scope of this summary lies the question broached by Veniero whether we are to rest content with assuming a Roman original for any epigrams that follow closely the lines of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid, as he believes, or whether

¹ A. J. P. XXXII 481.

¹ *όρθιον* reminds of a passage in Clemens Alexandrinus in which that raggicker of heathen wickednesses moralizes a nipple. The nipple of the maid, he says, looks up to the lover, the nipple of the mother looks down to the babe. All one beautiful summer semester I was doomed to hear Clemens Alexandrinus drawled out hundreds of times in Heinrich Ritter's lectures on Greek Philosophy and my work on Justin forced me to consult Clement. This is about all the real good I have got out of Clement. Veniero, who is on the look-out for Roman originals, has overlooked Prop. 2, 12, 21.

we are in all cases to assume an Alexandrian source for both. Whether in a given case we have Propertius or Philitas, must remain as undecided as the orthography of Philitas himself (A. J. P. XXXVII 200, fn. 5).

PART II.

The reader has doubtless noticed that I have tugged impatiently at the leading-strings of the Italian scholar to whose book I owe this holiday pastime. The path is well beaten, the sights are not novel, and now that I have made my acknowledgments to my Catanian colleague I am going to follow my own sweet will in dealing with Paulus.¹ I am going to indicate, or at any rate intimate, what would be my selection of Pauline epigrams, if I were called upon to act as a 'dutor titubantium' in this field of intoxicating perfume—the Greek Anthology. Of course, my selection will have regard to the judgment of others for there is really no more important study than the shifting of taste from one generation to another, these shifting that make new translations inevitable, as in the case of Sappho. Take Pope's translation of the close of the eighth book of the Iliad acclaimed as a masterpiece in its day and long after. Read Matthew Arnold's verdict. Read Tennyson's rendering, both final, as we say. Now Paulus is not worth all the trouble that such a study would require even if I had more material at hand. Of the *ἐπιτύμβια* an especial favourite is VII 307. It has been honoured by William Cowper's version and there is yet another rhymed rendering by J. A. Pott in Mr. Grundy's Ancient Gems. It is sadly commonplace.²

¹ In my comments on these selections I am not going to poach upon Professor Veniero's preserves. He has given parallels from other elegiac poets and discusses questions of origin and indebtedness. These marginalia are just a few of the thoughts that have come to me in the long summer months. They have the sole merit of spontaneity, a merit which would be lost by meticulous revision and correction. They are a manner of overgrown *Brief Mention*.

² Οὐνομά μοι . . . τι δὲ τοῦτο; πατρὶς δέ μοι . . . ἐσ τι δὲ τοῦτο;
κλειοῦ δ' εἰμι γένους . . . εἰ γὰρ ἀφαιροτάτου;
ζῆσας δ' ἐνδέξως ζειτον βλον . . . εἰ γὰρ ἀδέξως;
κεῖμαι δ' ἐνθάδε νῦν . . . τις τινι ταῦτα λέγεις;

Of the ἐπιδεικτικά the one that appeals to me most is IX 764 on the mosquito-net by reason of lifelong association with gallinipper and anopheles.¹ There is a bit of actuality about that as there is about the description of Constantinopolitan palaces, which takes me back to Seraglio Point and 1896.²

Of the προτρηπτικά X 74 has found favour in Mr. Grundy's eyes. It is a poem on Virtue. Somehow poems on Virtue from Aristotle down have never given me much pleasure. I rebelled against personifying ἀρετά in Pindar (O 1, 89) and now that in these latter days ἀρετή is identified with efficiency (A. J. P. XXXV 368) and 'Kultur', I prefer X 76.³ To be sure, it is the only epigram of Paulus' that sports the articular infinitive (A. J. P. XXXIII 107) but τὸ ζῆν is a plebeian early adopted into a patrician family and τὸ βίψαι has a commendable swing.

Paulus' dedicatory epigrams have found more favour with the older students of the Anthology than with Mackail and Grundy. I have already adverted to the unreality of the gods to whom some of them are dedicated. One of the ἀναθηματικά has been picked out by Mackail—Androklos' dedication of his bow to Apollo, the god of the bow. No connexion with

¹ Οὐ βριαρόν τινα θῆρα καὶ οὐ τινα πόντιον ἵχθύν,
οὐ πτερὸν ἀγρέων πλέγμασιν ἡμετέροις
ἀλλὰ βροτούς ἐθέλοντας. ἀλεξῆτειρα, δὲ τέχνη
ἀνέρα μυιάν κέντρον ἀλευθέμενον
ἐκ θαλῆς ἀβρῶτα μεσημβρίαντα φυλάσσει
οὐδὲν ἀφαυροτέρη τείχεος ἀστυόχου.
ὅπου δ' ἀστυφελικτον ἀγω χάριν· ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὺς
δμῶας μυιοσβόνι ρύομαι ἀτμενῆς.

² IX 663:

Πόντος ὑποκλύει χθονὸς ἔδραρα, πλωτὰ δὲ χέρσου
ῥῶτα θαλασσαῖοις ἀλεσσοῖς τηλεθέαι.
ὡς σοφός, διτις ἔμειξε βυθὸν χθονί, φύκια κήποις.
Νηϊάδων προχοαῖς χεύματα Νηρείδων.

³ οὐ τὸ ζῆν χαρίσσαν ἔχει φύσιν ἀλλὰ τὸ βίψαι
φροντίδας ἐκ στέριων τὰς πολιοκροτάφους.
πλούτοις ἔχειν ἐθέλω τὸν ἐπάρκιον. ἡ δὲ περισσὴ
θυμὸς δεῖ κατέδει χρυσομαρῆς μελέτη.
ἴνθεν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἀρειονα πολλάκι δήεις
καὶ πενήην πλούτου, καὶ βιότου θάνατον.
ταῦτα σὸν γιγνώσκων κραδίης θύμην κελεύθους
εἰς μιαν εἰσορόων ἀλπίδα τὴν σοφίην.

Androklos, the founder of Ephesus, says Veniero. Why not? Despite Wernicke and Harris (A. J. P. XXXVII 220) Apollo was the brother of Artemis, and as Androklos is only another form of Androkles, I am glad that Paulus did not have the bad taste to assign to Androklos VI 57, the dedication of a lion's skin. One group of these dedicatory epigrams has been mentioned already, in which we find a similar array of so-called dedicatory poems. My own favourite of the set and not mine only is VI 71, which seems to have escaped from the Armida garden of the *έρωτικά*. The framework of the poem, which craves translation, tempts to the sonnet, but a sonnet would require outrageous padding, such as I have perpetrated, A. J. P. XXXIII,¹ though nothing could well be worse in that way than the perilous stuffing one finds in Merivale's rhymed version (Bohn p. 409). Blank verse does less violence to the original, and the scarcity of compounds in the rendering shews the idiomatic difference of the two languages (A. J. P. XXXVII 236).

Σοὶ τὰ λιποστεφάνων διατίλματα μυρία φύλλων,
 σοὶ τὰ ποσπλήκτουν κλαστὰ κύπελλα μέθης,
 βιστρυχά σοι τὰ μύριοι δεδεμένα, τῷδε κονίη
 σκῦλα ποθοβλήτουν κείται 'Αναξαγόρα,
 σοι τάδε, Λαῖς, ἀπαντά παρὰ προδύροις γάρ δ δειλὸς
 τοισδέ σὺν ἀκρήβαις πολλάκι πανυχίσας,
 οὐκ ἔπος, οὐ χαρέσσαν ὑπέσχεσιν, οὐδὲ μελιχρῆς
 ἐλπίδος ὑβριστὴν μῦθον ἐπεσπάσατο·
 φεῦ φεῦ, γυιοτάκης δὲ λιπὼν τάδε σύμβολα κάμων,
 μέμφεται δαστρέπτουν κάλλει θηλυτέρης.

To thee the myriad leaves of shatter'd chaplets,
 To thee the broken cups of revel-routs,
 Curls wet with perfumes lying in the dust,
 Spoils won from love-smit Anaxagoras,
 Lais, all these to thee. How oft, poor wretch,
 He with his mates lay all night by thy door;
 No word, no gracious promise, no sweet hope
 Of frolic madness ever wrung from thee.
 Alas! forspent these tokens he must leave,
 And leaving, chide his 'Belle dame sans merci'.²

¹ See p. III.

² The only copy of the A. P. available for this holiday study was the pocket edition of Holtze (Carl Tauchnitz) 1865. If I have shewn any fitfulness or fretfulness in this little essay, it must be attributed to the damnable paper, which flaked off at the touch. Never have I had so

Of the 81 epigrams ascribed to Paulus, 40 are classed as ἑρωτικά and the various selections reflect the general opinion as to his excellence in that line. Of the ten in Mackail's Select Epigrams, six deal with Love. Of the eight in Mr. Grundy's Ancient Gems in Modern Settings, six have to do with the same distracting passion. That the same overwhelming proportion does not obtain in the Bohn-Burges volume can readily be understood if one considers that it is made up chiefly of older selections intended for schools. The best of Paulus' performances under this rubric are not for edification. In none of the selections do we find the Nessus shirt epigram (V 255),¹ as I am fain to call it, nor the invitation to untram-

exasperating an experience in dealing with a book, and I was not soothed by repeated opportunities of conjectural restoration. It was scant comfort that the edition symbolized the end of all things and gave point to the shattered wreaths of Lais' banquet.

*Ἐλδον ἔγώ ποθέοντας· ὑπ' ἀτλήτοι δὲ λύσσης
 δηρὸν ἐν ἀλλήλοις χελεα πηξάμενοι,
 οὐ κέρον είχον ἔρωτος ἀφειδός· ίέμενοι δέ,
 εἰ θέμις, ἀλλήλων δύμεναι ἐς κραδίην,
 ἀμφασίης δυσον δυσσον ὑπερβήνον ἀράγκην,
 ἀλλήλων μαλακοῖς φάρεσιν ἐστάμενοι,
 καὶ δὲ μὲν ἡρ' Ἀχιλῆι πανεκελος, ολος ἔκεινος
 τῶν Δυκομηδείων ἔνδον ἔην θαλάμων²·
 κούρη δὲ ἀργυρέψης ἐπιγουνίδος ἀχρι χιτῶνα
 ἔωσαμένη, Φοίβης είδος ἀπεκλάσατο.
 καὶ πάλιν ἡρήρειστο τὰ χελεα· γυνοβόρος γάρ
 είχον ἀλωφήτον λιμὸν ἔρωμαντης.
 δειά τις ἡμερόδον στελέχη δύο σύμπλοκα λύσει,
 στρεπτά, πολυχρονίω πλέγματι συμφύέα,
 ἡ κείουσ φιλέοντας, ὑπ' ἀντιστόροισ τ' ἀγοστοῖς
 ὑγρὰ περιπλέγδην ἀψε δησαμένους.
 τρίς μάκαρ, δε τοίσισ, φίλη, δεσμοῖσιν ἐλίχθη,
 τρίς μάκαρ· ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἀνδιχα καιόμενα.*

¹ This is the only poem of Paulus's that has a real glow, but the glow comes from vision not from action. Everyone will be reminded of the famous passage of Lucretius IV 1090-1101 which Veniero considers to be the original. Among my other debts to Paulus is the re-reading of Montaigne's delightful 'Sur quelques vers de Virgile', next to the longest of the Essais. Lucretius' 'penetrare et abire in corpus corpore toto' never fails to bring up to mind Canto XXV of the Inferno, which might well serve as an emblem of certain phases of marriage, mad lust and frantic divorce. The lesson was not intended by Dante, but is none the less impressive.

melded sport (V 252).¹ 'Le bon motif' does not appear in any of the Pauline poems, and the only poem that can be tortured into the acceptance of that canalization of love, called marriage, is V 221, which Mr. Rouse has translated and which is headed with due regard to Mrs. Grundy 'United'. V 221 is preceded by V 219 which has for its theme 'Stolen waters are sweet and bread eaten in secret is pleasant';² but in V 221 the poet gets tired of the 'Heimliche Liebe von der Niemand nichts weiss' and is supposed to be ready for the supreme sacrifice of matrimony with a view to the 'luxuriant indulgence' which Burns commends unreservedly and which Bernard Shaw condemns unsparingly.³

To begin with the beginning of Love's Litany, Paulus (V 217) leads off with Danae and the well-worn figure of her accessibility to gold—'Inclusam Danaen'—and the rest of it, Hor. C. 3, 16:

Χρύσεος ἀψίνστοιο διέτμαγεν δύμα κορείας
Ζεύς, διαδός Δανάας χαλκελάτους θαλάμους.
φαῦλι λέγειν τὸν μῦθον ἐγώ τάδε· 'Χάλκεα νικᾷ
τείχεα καὶ δεσμοὺς χρυσὸς δὲ πανδαμάτωρ.'
χρυσὸς δλους δυτῆρας, θλα κληδας ἐλέγχει,
χρυσὸς ἐπιγράψει τὰς σοβαροβλέφαρους·
καὶ Δανάας ἐλύγωσεν θδε φρένα. μή τις ἔραστης
λισσέσθω Παφλαν, ἀργύριον παρέχων.

χαλκελάτους θαλάμους is a variant of the Sophoklean χαλκο-δέτοις αὐλαῖς. Shorey says that the cynical interpretation of this myth seems to have been a commonplace and cites this passage among others. The anthologists never tire of it. It is needless to increase the number of references. I fancy that

¹ See p. 68.

² Κλέψυμεν, 'Ροδότηη, τὰ φιλήματα, τήν τ' ἐρατεινήν
καὶ περιδήριτον Κύπριδος ἐργασίην.
ἡδὺ λαθεῖτ, φυλάκων τε παναγρέα κανθὸν ἀλύξαι·
φώρια δ' ἀμφαδῶν λέκτρα μελιχρότερα.

³ Μέχρι τίνος φλογύδεσσαν ὑποκλέπτοντες δικωπήη
φώριον ἀλλήλων βλέμμα τιτυσκόμεθα;
λεκτέον ἀμφαδίην μελεδήματα· κήν τις ἐρύξη
μαλαθακὰ λυσιπόνου πλέγματα συζυγίης,
φάρμακον ἀμφοτέροις ξίφος ξυστεῖται· ἥδιον ήμιν
ξυνδὺ δεῖ μεθέπειν ή βίον ή θάνατον.

Antigone stopped her ears when the chorus intoned: ἔτλα καὶ Δανάς οὐδάνιον φῶς κτέ. The story was stale, the jest was doubtless stale even in Antigone's day, and there was no gleam of hope in it for her. She knew full well that Haimon was kept on short allowance by his father, Kreon, and did not possess the golden key necessary to her deliverance. Still the poets never tired of Danae. One of Euripides' plays dealt with Danae, or as Browning would say Euripides taught (ἔδιδαξεν) a Danae, and I have made the suggestion (A. J. P. I 457) that the caterwauling verse addressed by the chorus of the Wasps v. 273 to the shut-in Philokleon was a parody of Euripides. χρυσάνιος Ἀφροδίτα tells (So. O. C. 619) the story in brief and so does 'ceinture dorée' which reminds me of Asklepiades V 158:

Ἐρμιόη πιθανὴ ποτ' ἔγώ συντειξον, ἔχονση
ζωτὸν ἐξ ἀνθέων ποικίλον, ὡς Παφῆ,
χρύσεα γράμματ' ἔχον· διόλου δὲ ἔγέραπτο Φίλει με
καὶ μὴ λυπηθῆς, ἵν τις ἔχει μ' ἔτερος.

A philosophical soul was Asklepiades, as we have seen.

After the first poem 'les beaux yeux de ma cassette' disappear to be succeeded by the eyes of the lover and the beloved.

V 226:

Οφθαλμοί, τέο μέχρις ἀφύσσετε νέκταρ 'Ερατών,
κάλλεος ἀκρήτου ζωρόποται θρασέες;
τῆλε διαθρέξωμεν δηπο σθένος· ἐν δὲ γαλήνῃ
τηρηθεία σπεισώ Κύπριδι Μειλιχήρ.
ει δέ δρα τον καὶ κεῖθι κατάσχετος ξεσομαι οἰστρψ,
γίνεσθε κρυεροίς δάκρυσι μυδαλέοι,
ἔνδικον δτλήσοντες δει πόνον· ἐξ ὑμέων γάρ,
φεῦ, πυρὸς ἐ τόσσην ἥλθομεν ἐργασίην.

There is not so much ado about eyes as in Petrarch, but there is quite enough. In the much admired V 270, we find pearly complexion, golden hair, brilliancy that outvies the jacinth, dewy lips, sweet fellow-feeling

ἡ μελιφυρτος ἐκείνη
ἥθεος¹ ἀρμονίη

of which the cestus of Aphrodite is made, but the charm is in the eyes.

δημησι μούροις
θέλγομαι οἰς ἐλπίς μελιχος ἐνδιάει.

¹ See p. 51, but in view of Paulus' appetencies (p. 66) Hecker's στήθεος is tempting.

It is the expression of the eye that counts, its fire, its tenderness, its tears. Colour does not matter as it does in modern poetry, and no synonymous difference is made between *ὅμμα* and *ὅφθαλμός* (A. J. P. XXI 475). But the sturdiest synonyms are led astray by those mischievous sprites, the dactyls—tricky like their ancestral gnomes, the Idaean Dactyls,—or else crushed by the ponderous spondees, burnt out by the spitfire iambi and upset by the tripping trochees. Such well-established synonyms as *θάλασσα*, *πόντος*, *πέλαγος*, *ἄλς* are under the domination of the verse. One examination paper that I remember called for the Homeric form of a pluperfect passive that would have postulated five short syllables. There was no such Homeric pluperfect. *ἰδέσθαι* is common in Homer. Where is *ἰδέμενος*? (A. J. P. XXIX 278.) You can lay your money on *ὅμμα*. It will come in an easy winner. There are seven forms of *ὅμμα* in Paulus' *ἔρωτικά* to two of *ὅφθαλμός*. Still it is not always safe to bet on metrical availability everywhere as has been shewn in the case of *οὐτος* and *ὅδε* (A. J. P. XXIX 375).

Many of the epigrams deal with hair, but the most elaborate is V 260, in which the poet watches the tiring of his mistress' locks and beauty draws us not with a single hair but with a whole head of it. If her hair is confined by a coif, he is melted in love as he beholds in her a turreted Rhea. If she lets her auburn locks flow at their own sweet will, his spirit starts all a-flutter from his bosom. If she hides her curls under a silvren kerchief a flame intolerable possesses itself of his heart. A triplet of Graces encompasses the triple fashion. Each fashion starts a fire of its own. It is, as we have seen, admired by Veniero.

Κεκρύφαλοι σφίγγουσι τετὴν τρίχα ; τήκομαι οἰστρψ
 'Ρεις πυργοφόρου δείκελον εἰσορών.
 ἀσκετές ἔστι κάρηνον ; ἐγὼ ξανθίσμασι χαλτης
 ἔκχυτον ἐκ στέρνων ἐξεσόβησα νόον.
 ἀργενναῖς δόθησοι κατήρα βόστρυχα κεύθεις ;
 οὐδὲν ἐλαφροτέρη φλᾶξ κατέχει κραδίην.
 μορφὴν τριχθαδίην Χαρίτων τριάς ἀμφιπολεύει .
 πᾶσα δέ μοι μορφὴ πῦρ ἵδιον προχέει.

The poem has been deemed worthy of translation. It is only worthy of a furnace thrice-heated, and I cite it simply because of a sunny memory of Professor Sylvester and his great poem 'A Spring Idyl'. One evening he was reading this

memorable performance to a company of friends, and reading it with his wonted rhythmical emphasis. Each verse of the hundreds rhymed with 'in' or 'ine', and we admired his wonderful dexterity and range of knowledge. Unfortunately one of the audience ventured to say—he little knew Professor Sylvester—that he could not see much poetry in the line 'Neat as feathery back-hair-pin'. His wrath was kindled and burned fiercely until I quoted Horace's

in comptum Lacaenae
More comam religata nodum.

(C. 2, 11, 23) as a vindication of the truly poetical character of the line. In the printed copy he expressed his gratitude to me, and I thought of him and many other things when I called *ψίκομος* as applied to Helen a 'souvenir de Paris' (A. J. P. XXIX 122).

"If a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her", says the other Paulus, and this Paulus is of the same mind. As we have seen, a single hair has been a glory to him, and he has been honoured by a reference in Bartlett's Familiar Quotations, though his name is not mentioned. No love poet fails to sport with the tangles of Neaera's hair, and hair has a good eminence in the *ἔρωτικά* as it has a bad eminence in the *Μοῦσα παιδική*. The light of the eyes, the fire of the eyes, weeping eyes, tear-worn eyes—all the artillery of eyes is brought into play, but there is scant mention of colour. Yet there is no such indifference to the colour of the hair as Benedick shews when he says: 'Her hair shall be what colour please God'. All his heroines have golden hair. The blond has been the aristocratic from time immemorial, Menelaos' hair was the hair of a 'blond beast', and the steady encroachment of the dark man in the course of the ages marks the advance of democracy. Asklepiades V 210, 3 apologizes for his brunette: *εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τοῦτο*; as Sappho does for herself in Ovid, Her. 15, 35.

V 266 is something out of the ordinary and has been favoured by the translators.¹ They say that he who has been bitten by a

¹ Άνερα λυσσητῆρι κυνὸς βεβολημένον ιῷ
σδασι θηρετην εικόνα φασι βλέπειν.
λυσσών τάχα πικρὸν "Ἐρως ἐνέτηξεν δδόντα
εἰς ἐμέ, καὶ μανταις θυμὸν δλητσατο"
σὴν γὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ πόντος ἐπέχρατο εικόνα φανεῖ,
καὶ ποταμῶν δίραι, καὶ δέπας οἰνοχόων.

rabid hound sees in the water the image of the beast. So it seems that ' rabid love has fixed his bitter tooth in me, and has made prey (not to say ' game ') of my spirit in fits of madness. It must be so for the deep sea shews thy lovely image to me, and the river with its whirling current and the goblets of them that serve the wine (*οινοχόων*, others *οινοχόον*)'. I am not bitten by the love of the epigram and I shut out the image of the mad dog by the familiar lines ' Denn es umschwebt mich überall mild Meiner geliebten zaubrisches Bild '. There is too much madness in the world at any rate and V 266 must be dismissed to keep company with the other epigram in which the fire of love is compared to the poisoned mantle sent by Medea to Jason's bride. In this poem (V 288) Paulus calls her *Κρεονιάδα*, which Veniero simplifies by ' corinzia '. Patronymics have a charm to poets of every order from Homer down. Ovid must have sighed when he resigned that sonorous close of the pentameter for a rather scant assortment of iambi.

V 232. A fickle maiden speaks and tells how she turns from Hippomenes to Leandros, from Leandros to Xanthos and from Xanthos back to Hippomenes.¹ ' Elegantissimo epigramma ' says Veniero, who cites a host of parallels, of which there is no lack in American life. But as I read, my mind went back to Bonn and I sat once more in Ernst Moritz Arndt's lecture-room and heard him repeat with unction: Ich bin ein Mädchen von Flandern, Und springe vom einen zum andern. The history of Flanders shews many changes. The change to constancy may be another.

V 234 is one of two poems that deal with the sorrows of a middle-aged man, a ' ci-devant jeune homme ', an *ώμογέρων* in

¹ Ιππομένη φιλέουσα, νόον προσέρεισα Δεάνδρῳ·
έν δὲ Λεανδρεῖος χεῖλεσι πηγνυμένη.
εἰκότα τὴν Ξάνθῳ φέρω φρεσὶ πλεξαμένη δὲ
Ξάνθον, ἐν Ιππομένην νόστιμον ἡτορ δίγω.
πάρτα τὸν ἐν παλάμυσιν ἀναίνομα· ἀλλοτε δ' ἀλλο
αὖτε ἀμοιβαῖοις πήχεσι δεχνυμένη,
ἀφρειτὴν Κυθέρειαν ὑπέρχομαι. εἰ δέ τις δημίν
μέμφεται, ἐν πενήῃ μιμέτω οἰογάμῳ.

love.¹ Veniero, as has been noted, sees in this epigram a note of actuality. In one of his Odes, Horace considers himself immune at forty. At fifty he feels the stirring of what is popularly known as the youth of old age, as dangerous an age for a man as forty for a woman. Here we have an old fellow with 'lyart haffets' who has renounced Pallas for Aphrodite. The measles of love goes hard with an old boy. Think of Goethe's last love affair (A. J. P. XXIII 111). The second plaint (V 264) goes into greater detail and asks for more than a smile from the cruel fair.² The poet gives a more minute description of his faded hair, his eyes wet with tears, his eyeballs the footballs of ineffectual longing, tokens of the darts of love. Untimely wrinkles already furrow his flanks, a flabby dewlap hangs from his chin. As the flowers of love's flame wax young, in like measure do his joints wax old by reason of his carking care. Shew pity, lady, grant him favour and forthwith his flesh will take on youth again and his hair turn black once more. It is only the man, be it noted, whose hair is black. No answer is vouchsafed. The confession of his wrinkled flank was fatal. 'Qui latus argueret corneus arcus erat', says Master Ovid of the chaste Penelope: and imagination supplies the mocking answer to this lovesick plea: *Prenez garde, je pourrais faiblir.*

¹ Ο πρὶν ἀμαλθάκτουσιν ὑπὸ φρεσὶν ἡδὺν ἐν ἥβῃ
οἰστροφόρου Παφίνις θεσμὸν ἀπειπάμενος,
γυνοβόροις βελέεσσιν ἀνέμβατος δὲ πρὶν Ἐρέτων,
αὐχέρα τοι κλίνω, Κύπρι, μεσαιπόλιος.
δέξο με καγχαλώσα, σοφὴ δις Παλλάδα νικᾶς
νῦν πλέον η τὸ πάρος μῆλῳ ἔφει 'Εσκερίδων.

² Βόστρυχος ὀμογέροντα τί μέμφει, δυματά θ' ὑγρὰ
δάκρυσιν; ὑμετέρων παίγνια ταῦτα πόθων
φροντίδες ἀπρήκτοιο πόδουν τάδε, ταῦτα βελέμυρων
σύμβολα, καὶ δολιχῆς ἔργα νυχεγρεσίης.
καὶ γάρ του λαγόνεσσι δύτις παραώριος ἡδη,
καὶ λαγαρὸν δειρῆ δέρμα περικρέμαται.
διτέσσον ήβδοκει φλογὺς δύθεα, τέσσον ἐμεῖο
δύψεα γηράσκει φροντίδες γυνοβόρῳ.
ἀλλὰ καροκτίρασα δίδον χάριν· αὐτίκα γάρ μοι
χρὼς ἀναθηλήσει κρατὶ μελαινομένῳ.

V 244.¹ 246,² we have what would be called in some parts of America a kissing bee. In the Parisians the elder Lytton puts the word 'bee' as an equivalent of 'company' in the mouth of a Confederate colonel—as it seemed to me not very aptly. There is, says Paulus, the long resounding kiss of Galatea, the soft kiss of Demo, the incisive kiss of Doris, but his heart responds to Demo.

*εἰ δέ τις ἄλλη
τέρπεται, ἐκ Δημοῦς ἡμέας οὐκ ἔρυσει.*

Somehow the loud resounding kiss does not sort very well with what we know of Galatea elsewhere, but what he says of Sappho flies in the face of our conception of the poetess. 'Soft her kisses, soft the embraces of her snowy limbs, but her heart is of adamant, ψυχὴ δ' ἐξ ἀδάμαντος'. Her love stops at the lips. Could Paulus have ever read anything of burning Sappho's? We often envy the Byzantines their richer stores but they seem to have been more familiar with Menander (V 217) than with the early lyrists. Schwartz could not have read the Anthology very carefully when he questioned whether Menander's works were known in Julian's time (A. J. P. XVII 249). Tell us, Pothos and Himeros, why has Paulus taken the name of Sappho in vain? We forgive him for playing with Theokritos' Galatea but he ought to have let Sappho sleep alone.

V 248 is an apology for the liberties taken by the poet's hands. The modern's first thought is of a situation often referred to by Paulus, for he is what La Fontaine calls an 'amoureux de têtos'. In V 258 (p. 55) there is one proof text, in V 272 (p. 71) there is another. But for that he does not apolo-

¹ Μακρὰ φιλεῖ Γαλάτεια καὶ θυμόφα, μαλθακὰ Δημώ.
Δωρὶς ὁδακτάζει, τίς πλέον ἔξερέθει;
οὐατὰ μὴ κρίνωσι φιλήματα· γενσάμενοι δὲ
τριχθαδίων στομάτων, ψῆφον ἐποισόμενα.
ἐπλάγχητος, κραβῆτη· τὰ φιλήματα μαλθακὰ Δημοῦς
ἔγνως καὶ δροσερών ἥδν αέλι στομάτων·
μίμν' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀδέκαστον ἔχει στέφος. εἰ δέ τις ἄλλη
τέρπεται, ἐκ Δημοῦς ἡμέας οὐκ ἔρυσει.

² Μαλθακὰ μὲν Σαπφοῦς τὰ φιλήματα, μαλθακὰ γυνίων
πλέγματα χιονέων, μαλθακὰ πάντα μελη·
ψυχὴ δ' ἐξ ἀδάμαντος ἀπειθέος· ἄχρι γάρ οἰων
ἔστιν ἔρως στομάτων, τᾶλλα δὲ παρθενίης.
καὶ τις ὑποτλαῖη; τάχα τις, τάχα τοῦτο ταλάσσας
δίψαν Τανταλέην τλήσεται εὐμαρέως.

gize. It is part of the game. The liberties here meant are those taken by so many antique lovers and modern wife-beaters. The Roman elegists are much given to whipping the stream of love and the remains of Menander's *Περικερομένη* have brought this phase of love to the front of late. My own mind turns to Lucian, *Dialog. Meretr.* 8 and to my early reading of St. Augustin's *Confessions*—from which I learned that St. Monica was beaten by her husband Patricius, though St. Monica really seems to have deserved her punishment.¹

V 250 might be a modern drawing-room scene, such as we find depicted in our illustrated magazines. Sweet are the tears of Lais, *γλυκύδακρυς* is one of Meleager's adjectives—tears for fear her lover may leave her after all. Men were deceivers ever—the old song.²

The 'comédie larmoyante' of love is much better managed here than in V 275³ in which the lover takes an unhallowed

¹ Ω παλάμη πάντολμε, σὺ τὸν παγχρύσεον ἔτλης
ἀπρὶς δραξαμένη βόστρυχοι αὐτὸν ἔρυσαι·
ἔτλης; οὐκ ἐμάλαξε τεὸν θράσος αἰλινος αὐδῆ,
σκύλμα κόμης, αὐχὴν μαλθακὰ κεκλιμένος.
νῦν θαυμοῖς πατάγοισι μάτην τὸ μέτωπον ἀράσσεις·
οὐκέτι γὰρ μαζοῖς σὸν θέναρ ἐμπελάσει.
μή, λίτομαι, δέσποινα, τόσην μὴ λάμβανε ποινήν·
μᾶλλον ἔγώ τλαίην φάσγανον δσπασίως.

² Ήδύ, φίλοι, μείδημα τὸ Δαίδος· ἡδὺ κατ' αὐτὸν
ήπιοδινήτων δάκρυ χέει βλεφάρων.
χθιζά μοι ἀπροφάσιστον ἐπέστενεν, ἐγκλιδὸν ὄμφ
ἡμετέρῳ κεφαλὴν δηρὸν ἐρεισαμένη·
μυρομένην δ' ἐφίλησα· τὰ δ' ὡς δροσερῆς ἀπὸ πηγῆς
δάκρυα μυρυμένων πίκτε κατὰ στομάτων.
εἶπε δ' ἀνειρομένη, 'Τίνος εἰνεκα δάκρυα λείβεις';
'Δεῖδα μή με λίπης· ἐστὲ γὰρ ὄρκαπάται.'

³ Δειελινῷ χαρεσσα Μενεκρατὶς ἔκχυτος ὑπνῳ
κείτο περὶ κροτάφους πῆχυν ἐλιξαμένη·
τολμήσας δ' ἐπεβήη λεχέων ὑπερ. ὡς δὲ κελεύθου
ἥμισυ κυπριδίης ἥπνου δσπασίως,
ἡ παῖς ἐξ ὑπνου διέγρετο, χεροὶ δὲ λευκαῖς
κράστος ἡμετέρου πᾶσαν ἔτιλλε κόμη·
μαρναμένης δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀνύσσαμεν ἔργον ἔρωτος.
ἡ δ' ὑποπικτλαμένη δάκρυσιν εἶπε τάδε·
'Σχέτλιε, νῦν μὲν ἔρεκας δ τοι φίλον, ψέπι πουλὸν
τολλάκι σῆς παλάμης χρυσὸν δπωμοσάμην·
οιχόμενος δ' ἀλλην ὑποκόλπιον εὐθὺς ἐλίκεις·
ἐστὲ γὰρ ἀπλήστου Κέπριδος ἐργατίναι.'

advantage of the sleep of his beloved. The situation is familiar. The order of the action reminds one of Petronius, and the tearful close recalls one of Hogarth's pictures, significantly called 'After'. It is the coarsest of Paulus' performances, but even Meleager sins at times (e. g. V 263), and betrays his Gergesene blood by consorting with the swine, as on the other hand even Straton has been admitted into the refined society of Mr. Mackail's readers.

V 252 which is an Introduction to the Dance of Love reminds me of a passage in Mérimée's *Lettres à une Inconnue* in which he describes the nude figure that heads a Bacchanal procession as 'un monsieur dépourvu de toute décence'—and in this poem Paulus' study of the nude may seem to fall under the same reprobation—and his translator may have to bear a like charge, but whenever I ramble through the Anthology, the tickling devil of rhyme assails me, and perhaps I shall be forgiven for this specimen of the forbidden fruit:

Let us cast our robes aside
 For our play, my charming <bride>,
 Naught between us be, no space
 Interfere with our embrace ;
 Any filmy lace at all
 Be to us a Chinese wall ;
 Breast to breast in closest clip,
 Lip be prest to dewy lip.
 For the rest my modest Muse
 Must the open door refuse.¹

'Bride' is a tribute to morality and to that 'mad negro' as Verlaine calls 'rhyme'; 'Chinese wall' is a suggestion of Veniero's; 'dewy lip' is borrowed from V 270, but it is at any rate in 252 an *epitheton ornans*. I have never seen a rhyming translation of it in English, and there are those who will think

¹ Πίγμανε, χαρίσσα, τὰ φάρεα· γυμνὰ δὲ γυμνοῖς
 ἐμπελάσει γνίσις γνίδια περιπλοκάδηρ·
 μηδὲν έσι τὸ μεταξύ· Σεμιράμιδος γάρ ἐκείνῳ
 τείχος ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ λεπτὸν οὐφασμα σίθεν·
 στήθεα δ' ἔξενχθω, τὰ τε χείλεα· τᾶλλα δὲ σιγῇ
 κρυπτέον· ἔχθαίρω τὴν ἀνυροστομίην.

that I might have been better employed.¹ Here is what Veniero makes of it:

Giù! spogliamo, o graziosa, le vesti; poi nude le membra
 S'intrecceranno strette con le tue membra nude!
 Nulla di mezzo resti! Ben l'alta muraglia sarebbe
 Di Semiramide qui solo un leggero velo.
 Ecco: petto su petto, le labbra compriman le labbra,
 Zitto sul resto: ho in odio lingua che freno non ha

V 262. Alas! alas! for the honeyed speech and the glance of the lids with their secret utterance. No matter how near we stand to each other we are numbed by the gaze of a crone like unto the multiple eye of the herdsman of the daughter of Inachos. Stand and spy and fret thy soul for thou canst not stretch thy vision to the soul.² The herdsman is Argos and the daughter of Inachos—Io, as it is needless to explain. I have already commented parenthetically on Veniero's remark about the mythological learning displayed by Paulus and his like. Any schoolboy of my day, when Lemprière's dictionary was the standard would have been equal to solving all Pauline problems of that sort. The most remote allusion I have found is the reference to the 'Cretan judgment-seat' a periphrase for Minos.³ V 274. In his rendering Veniero has substituted

¹ As I was hesitating whether to print this or not, my eye fell on 'Toi et Moi', a collection of poems by Paul Géraldy, which reached its ninth edition in 1916, and in these days of classical echoes, I am encouraged to cite a passage which may have been inspired by Paulus or haply the other Paulus's messenger of Satan.

Prenons-nous. Le meilleur moyen
 De s'expliquer sans être dupe
 C'est de s' étreindre corps à corps.
 Vite! allons. Viens dans mes bras toute nue.

² φεῦ φεῦ, καὶ τὸ λάλημα τὸ μειδικὸν δὲ φθόνος εἴργει,
 βλέμμα τε λαθριδίων φθεγγομένων βλεφάρων.
 Ισταμένης δ' ἀγχιστα τεθήπαμεν δύμα γεραιῆς,
 οἰα τολύγληνος βουκόλον Ἰραχίης.
 Ιστασο, καὶ σκοκιάζε, μάτηη δὲ σὸν ἡτορ ἀμύσσον·
 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψυχῆς δύμα τεδὺ τανύσεις.

³ Τὴν πρὸν ἐνεσφρήγισσεν Ἐρως θρασὺς εἰκόνα μορφῆς
 ἡμετέρης θερμῷ βένθεῖ σῆς κραδίης,
 φεῦ φεῦ, νῦν ἀδόκητος ἀπέπτυσας· αὐτὰρ ἐγώ τοι
 γραπτὸν ἔχω ψυχῆς σῆς τύπον ἀγλαίης.
 τοῦτον καὶ Φαέθοντι καὶ Ἀΐδη, βάρβαρε, δείξω,
 Κρήσσαν ἐπισπέρχων εἰς σὲ δικασπολίην.

‘Minosse’ for Κρῆσσαν δικαιοπολίνη a proceeding against which I protested not long ago (A. J. P. XXXVII 284).

V 268. Sadly familiar is the St. Sebastian of love,¹ though not quite so familiar as the Christian saint in the picture-galleries of Europe. ‘Let no one fear the shafts of desire. Eros has emptied all his quiver in me.’ Very different, by the way, is the Oriental quiver in the matter of love and I never follow the example of those who are fond of calling the head of a large family Mr. Quiverful with a supposedly playful reference to Ps. 127, 4: As arrows are in the hands of a mighty man, so are the children of thy youth. 5. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them. My former pupil Dr. Briggs translated it ‘that hath filled his quiver with them’ and I am reminded of Sirach 25, 12 where we find a more drastic expression for Ez. 16, 25. As I have a character for refinement to sustain and have moreover a wholesome dread of Herr Keil (A. J. P. XXXVII 272) I quote the LXX version: κατέναντι παντὸς πασσάλου καθῆσεται καὶ ἔναντι βέλους ἀνοίξει φαρέτραν.

V 272. Eyes, as we have seen, dominate but lips have their turn and one is tempted to say “Take, oh take those lips away” (that by this time are outworn), but what if the ηθεος ἀρμονίη be lacking. This is a point on which Paulus insists. There must be no divided allegiance. The lady of this poem is one of those who as Juvenal says ‘concumbunt Graece’. Horace has his fling at the literary lady who anticipates Catherine of Russia. Paulus is evidently of the same opinion with Rivarol: Ayez du goût comme un beau fruit, Et de l'esprit comme une rose. No half Athena, half Aphrodite for him. To adapt one of Thackeray's parodies—Take her for half and half, I would not care to see her like again. Sei nur nichts halb, says Goethe. It is good Epicurean doctrine, but preeminently good Stoic doctrine, and I have actually cited Calvin to my purpose,

¹ Μηκέτι τις πτήξειε πόθου βέλος· ιοδόκην γάρ
εἰς ἐμὲ λάβρος “Ερως ἔσεκένωσεν δλην.
μὴ πτερύγων τρομέοι τις ἐπήλυσιν” ἔξότε γάρ μοι
λάξ ἐπιβάσ στέρνοις πικρὸν ἐπηξ πόδα.
δοτεμφῆς, ἀδύνητος ἐνέζεται, οὐδὲ μετέστη,
εἰς ἐμὲ συζυγίην κειράμενος πτερύγων.

Persius, Introduction.¹ In V 272² and V 300³ we have a portrait of a Byzantine Kate the Curst. She is addressed as *παρθένε θυμολέαινα* in this love-ditty, but the character of her set might seem to justify Wilamowitz's contention that *παρθένος* does not mean 'virgin'—as it must mean in Theok. Id. XXVII s. f. and in many other passages in which the word *παρθένος* is used. *θυμολέαινα* set me to thinking about the etymology of *Λαίς*. Aristippus' famous mot <*Λαίδα*> *ἔχω ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχομαι* suggests **λαίειν* and *λαβεῖν* and Homer's *ἀσπαίροντα λάων* becomes *ἀσπαίροντα <λάουσα>*, but it is not improbable that Lais was a Syrian importation—and 'lionne' would not be a bad name for her. These women of the half-world, or rather the whole world, bore significant names as we can see from Horace's list (A. J. P. XVIII 122).

Of course, I could keep up this line of comment indefinitely, but it is time to turn to other matters of graver import to a scholar than those trifles, which may seem unworthy of the grave profession which I have relinquished. A word then on the subject of composition. Another and still briefer on the subject of syntax in Paulus.

I have already adverted to the number of compounds employed by Paulus. Statistics seem to be needless in so plain a matter, but I have made a rough count for my own satisfaction. There are about 125 distichs in the remains of Simonides, genuine and spurious. Take twenty-seven of the *έρωτικά* of

¹ P. xxxii, where 'qui' should follow 'dimidium', a correction I have been yearning to make these forty odd years.

² Μαῖοντις χερσὶν ἔχω, στόματι στόμα, καὶ περὶ δειρὴν
δοχετα λυσσών βόσκομαι ἀργυφένη,
οὕτω δ' Ἀφρογένειαν δλην ἔλον· ἀλλ' ἔτι κάμνω,
παρθένον ἀμφιέπων λέκτρον ἀναινομένην.
ἥμισιν γάρ Παφίη, τὸ δ' ἄρ' ἥμισιν δῶκεν Ἀθήνη·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μέσσος τήκομαι ἀμφοτέρων.

³ Ο θρασὺς ὑψαύχην τε καὶ ὀφρύας εἰς ἐν ἀγελρων
κεῖται παρθενικῆς πατέριον ἀδρανός.
δ πρὶν ὑπερβασίῃ δοκέων τὴν παῖδα χαλέπτειν,
αὐτὸς ὑποδημῆσις ἐλπίδος ἔκτὸς ἔβη.
καὶ δέ δὲ μὲν ικεσίοις πεσὼν θηλύεται οἰκτοις·
ἡ δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν δρσενα μῆνιν ἔχει.
παρθένε θυμολέαινα καὶ εἰ χόλον ἔνδικον αἰθεῖ,
σβέσσον ἀγηνορήην, ἐγγύδες δέ τι Νέμεσιν.

Paulus, which hold about the same number and compare them with the first 125 distichs of the Theognidea and the excess of compounds in Paulus will prove to be considerable. That the excess over Simonides is not so great is due to the great number in the two spurious *eis 'Avakréovra*. The Greek moderation shews itself here as it shews itself in the use of periphrastic tenses. And then we must consider the character of the compounds. Many of the compounds in Theognis and Simonides are familiar and easy combinations, which cannot be said of Paulus. 'The learned Greek—blessed in the lovely marriage of pure words'—was given to spawning in the later centuries on the German principle: *Wer lang hat, lässt lang hängen*, or as the Italians put it: *Chi ha del panno può menar la coda*. A comparison of Plato and Plutarch would be suggestive.

Of the syntax there is little to be said or that I care to say. Like modern versewrights Paulus escapes censure by his close adherence to his predecessors. The optative was practically dead in his day and we are not surprised at the potential without $\bar{a}v$ V 246, V 254 but with $\bar{a}v$ -sounds in the neighborhood, *τλαίην φάσγανον ἀσταοῖως* as happens to his betters (A. J. P. XII 387). There is a leaning to the imperative optative V 252, 2; 268, 1 and *μηκέτι* with the participle shews the inevitable trend V 228. On the articular infinitive I have remarked already.¹

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

¹ Mr. Paton in his Preface to his Translation of the Greek Anthology, received after this article was in type, says that 'the Byzantine Anthologists wrote in a language which they did not command, but by which they were commanded, as all who try to write ancient Greek are'. Well, the Byzantines were much more obedient to the command of the language than some of their modern rivals, and I have been struck by their appreciation of the ethos of Greek Syntax at points which have been overlooked by grammarians of high rank. They do not actually eschew the articular infinitive, but they are shy of it as we are shy of using in more elevated language an infinitive for a substantive. 'In the know', 'in the swim' are not poetical expressions. Elegiac poetry on the whole avoids the articular infinitive (A. J. P. XXXIII 107). 'Ἄδν τὸ βιεῖν (V 29) is an exception that proves the point of the vulgar origin. Mr. Paton's *fruition*' is a mistranslation. The pres. inf. has to do with process, not attainment, and I cannot recall an aorist of the verb. It is a case for Osthoff's *Suppletivwesen* (A. J. P. XXI 474).

IV.—THE PRONUNCIATION OF A FINAL CONSONANT WHEN FOLLOWED BY AN INITIAL CONSONANT IN A LATIN WORD-GROUP.

We are well aware of the fact that in speaking English or in reading it aloud we do not pronounce the several words of a sentence exactly as we would pronounce them in a dictionary, for instance, if they were written in a column one above another. Sometimes cultivated foreigners who have had only a limited opportunity to speak English, by making independent units of all the words in a sentence in their rendition of it, remind us of our accepted practice by way of contrast. But in ordinary conversation, if I ask a friend, "Were you at home day before yesterday", he notices that in two respects I fail to preserve the integrity of the individual words. His ear catches not seven but two units in my question. One of these is made up of the first four words with a primary accent on "home", and in the second three-word unit there is perhaps a secondary accent on "day" and a primary accent on the first syllable of "yesterday". In the second place he notices that the third and fourth words are run together and are pronounced as if written atom. From this illustration it is clear that words in connected discourse may not retain the same pronunciation and accent which they have when they stand detached from one another. Of course this method of speaking and reading is not peculiar to English. In such a sentence as *vous-aurez de quoi vous-occuper au logis* we see a similar grouping with like results. If we pass from the formal to the vulgar speech of any language the changes in accentuation and in the influence which words within a group have upon the pronunciation of one another become still more marked. This fact is clearly enough indicated, for instance, by the shop girl's "Whad-chew think-uv't?" (= "What did you think of it?").

To what extent were words grouped in Latin according to sense, and what effect did this grouping have on the pronunciation of a sentence? These are two of the questions which

naturally suggest themselves to us from observing our usage in the case of connected discourse in English. As is well known, considerable progress has already been made in answering the first question by Lindsay, Ramain, Skutsch, and others. From their investigations it has been established that sentence enclitics and proclitics include not only certain particles like -que and -ve, but also various forms of the substantive verb, the personal, possessive and demonstrative pronouns, when unemphatic, relative and indefinite pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, and many nouns of colorless meaning. Consequently we get such word-groups as *circum-litora*, *meús-pater*, *operám-dare*, *volo-scíre*, and *quómodo*. Indeed we may say with confidence that the Roman grouped his words in speaking or reading as the English-speaking person does to-day.

Some progress has been made too in determining the principles of sentence-accentuation. Consequently, we shall pass over these subjects and address ourselves to the second and more obscure point of difference, noted above, considering the influence which words within a group have on the pronunciation of one another. We are thinking of course of the phonetical changes which may occur between the final syllable of one word in a sentence and the initial syllable of the following word. In the sequence of these two syllables four different cases are possible. One word may end in a vowel and the next word may begin with a vowel,¹ or we may have the combination of a vowel and a consonant, or of a consonant and a vowel, or of a consonant and a consonant. We may have, for instance, *opera interrupta*, *memorabile numen*, *per ossa*, or *iterum narrans*. Let us confine our attention to combinations of the *iterum-narrans* type, because less seems to be known about them than about the others, and because any information which may be had concerning their pronunciation will be of far-reaching importance for the correct reading of Latin, since, if phonetical changes arise in combinations of this character, they are likely to be numerous and important.

¹ An interesting treatment of this phase of the subject may be found in the article by Sturtevant and Kent entitled "Elision and Hiatus in Latin Prose and Verse" in the *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* Vol. XLVI (1915) 129-155.

In seeking to determine whether such changes take place or not, we may look for evidence in the statements made on this point by Latin writers or in the phonetical spellings found in inscriptions or in manuscripts. There are at least three passages, two in Cicero (ad fam. 9. 22. 2 and Orat. 154) and one in Quintilian (8. 3. 45) which are of special interest in this connection. They prove beyond question that the final *m* of *cum* the preposition and the conjunction was assimilated to an initial *n* in the following word. The reference which both writers make to assimilation in these cases is incidental to the discussion of another subject, so that their failure to mention other cases of assimilation beside that of *m* followed by *n* does not at all carry the implication that the phenomenon was limited to this combination.

For further evidence, as has been intimated, we may turn to the phonetical spellings in the inscriptions and manuscripts. Naturally we shall find such spellings only in the productions of the illiterate, and even there we should bear the fact in mind that every one of the engravers or copyists involved made an earnest effort to spell in the accepted fashion, so that each deviation from the norm counts for more than its face value.

The inscriptions which I have examined for the purpose of getting light on the points in question are contained in the collections made by Diehl and bearing the titles *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften* and *Pompeianische Wandinschriften*, together with the Latin inscriptions in Audollent's *Defixionum Tabellae*. Together they number about twenty-five hundred, and therefore furnish a reasonable amount of suitable material for the purpose in question. They are inscriptions in which we should look for phonetical spellings, because most of the people who composed or engraved them were evidently illiterate. They come from all parts of the Empire, and unfortunately few of them can be dated accurately, but almost all of them belong to the imperial period. We have assumed on a priori grounds and from the English analogue that if the sequence of the final and initial consonant of two consecutive words give rise to any phonetical changes, the changes will occur within word-groups. This assumption is established by what we find in the vulgar inscriptions. Almost without exception assimilation takes place

between the parts of a word-group. It will suffice to cite a few illustrations of this fact, such cases, for instance, as *sextunque* (V. L. In. 241), *cun coniuge* (1375), *in quan die* (616), *pos morte* (1462), *at tuos* (229), *ommeritis* (1327) *no mereti* = *non merenti* (688), *tan cito* (1097), and *emmimoriam* = *in memoriam* (155).

One naturally asks if the cases of phonetical spelling to be found in the vulgar inscriptions are clear enough and numerous enough to enable us to determine the phonetical laws upon which they rest. It seems possible to answer that question in the affirmative.

Final *m* furnishes the largest number of instances where a phonetical change occurs. Seelmann in his *Aussprache d. Latein*, p. 268 ff., has explained the fluctuation between final *m* and *n* in certain epigraphical forms by assuming the existence of a sound which was not accurately represented by either letter, but such a sound would almost certainly have been preserved in the Romance languages, and they show no trace of it, as Seelmann himself confesses, so that his theory can hardly be accepted. How this fluctuation should be explained comes out with reasonable clearness from the facts found in the vulgar inscriptions. In these inscriptions there are 73 cases of final *n* for *m*. So far as the initial letter of the next word is concerned, they are grouped as follows: Before initial *n* 2 cases, *t* 2, *th* 1, *d* 4, *c* or *k* 12, *q* 20, *s* 3, *f* 5, *v* 3, *l* 1, *p* 9, *m* 5, *r* 1, and before an initial vowel 5. Now if we look at the principles of assimilation which are followed in compounds where *m* is brought before another consonant, taking compounds with *com-* for convenience in comparison, we find that *com-* appears as *con-* before *t*, *d*, *c*, *q*, *g*, *s*, *f*, and *v*; as *com-* before *p*, *b*, and *m*; before *l* as *con-* or *col-*, before *r* usually as *cor-*, before *n* as *co-*.

If we turn now to the vulgar inscriptions, of the 68 instances where one of two words in a word-group ends in *m* and the following one begins with a consonant, we see the same rules of assimilation followed in 50 of these cases, viz., with initial *t*, *d*, *c*, *q*, *s*, *f*, and *v*, as govern the treatment of the final consonant of the first member in a compound. To these we may properly add the 2 cases of complete assimilation before *n*.

making 52 in all out of 68.¹ The 14 cases of *n* before *p* and *m* are a little surprising at first sight, but they probably represent a tendency frequently seen in the writings of the illiterate who, in their misdirected efforts to be correct, unwittingly offset errors of one kind by committing mistakes of exactly the opposite sort. The writer, for instance, who puts down *mesis* or *abitat* in one line will very likely make his average use of the written *n* and *h* good in the next line by using the forms *pariens* or *hegit*. In a similar way we should probably explain such spellings as *fecerum filio* for *fecerunt filio* (Diehl, V. I. 678), of which there are five cases in the body of these inscriptions before the initial consonants *f*, *s*, and *q*, and the same statement may be made concerning the form *obitorunt* for *obitorum* (575). Another form of this sort, *eorunt* for *eorum*, is cited by Diehl in his monograph *De m finali epigraphica*, p. 287. Altogether there are twenty-one instances where the combination *-nt* loses the dental, either before a consonant or at the end of a sentence. The loss never occurs before a vowel, which would tend to show that in the grouping of such combinations the dental was pronounced where it could be joined without difficulty to the following vowel, but that when a consonant followed, it was eliminated.²

Returning for a moment to the simple nasals we find the adverb *non* reduced to *no* in eight cases,³ *co* for *con-* or *com-* twice.⁴ In all these cases, of which *no mala* and *co suis* may be given as illustrations, the phonetical changes indicated are parallel to those with which we are familiar in the interior of words in the vulgar inscriptions, in such forms as *tosores* (Di. V. I. 649), *Cocessae* (716), and *ad iferos* (439). The actual linking together of words, with the suppression of the final nasal,

¹ It seems unnecessary to cite all of these cases. The following illustrations taken from Diehl's *Vulgärlat. Inschr.* will show their character: *con qua* 655, *quan nunc* 707, *cun fratribus* 777, *cun cenaculis* 785, *donun dedit* 604, *cun suis* 608, *felicen te* 615, *nunquan nemine* 1498.

² Some illustrations are *fuerun debuit* (Diehl, V. I. 494), *fecerun qui debuerun*, at end of line (569). In this connection we should perhaps notice the three cases (*posuoru* 296, *feceru* 606, and *locaveeru* 1430), all at the end of a sentence or a line, where the entire ending *-nt* is dropped.

³ Diehl, V. I. 182, 373, 688, 711; Diehl, P. W. 459, 659; Audollent 22066, 221, 23.

⁴ Diehl, V. I. 54, 289.

is illustrated in centumilia (425, 636) titulumemoriens (540), hominesse (634), molestust¹ = molestum est (633), moriundust = moriundum est (633), moriendust = moriendum est (634), and redeudus = redeundum (est) (635). The consciousness of the illiterate man that he is liable to this error in his pronunciation is shown by the perverse spelling of nonmina for nomina in No. 575.

Under *b*, in the word-groups ommeritis (Diehl, V. I. 1327), and o meritis (ibid. 1437), we find the same assimilation as occurs in summito for submitto.

The treatment of final *d* and *t* before initial consonants is puzzling. There are cases, like at tuos (Diehl, V. I. 229), and deded donavit (411), where assimilation is shown by the change which takes place in the accepted form of the first word. It is also noticeable that there are fifty-two changes of the historically correct *d* to *t* and only two from *t* to *d*, and that this difference in treatment corresponds in a striking way to the difference in the character of the words ending in *d* and *t* in Latin. Most of those ending in *t* are verbs and are naturally the last words in a phrase, while those ending in *d* are proclitics. In the vulgar inscriptions under discussion, for instance, the words in which the final *d* is changed to *t* are ad, apud, aliud, aliquid, quod, sed, and quoad.² It may be worth noticing also that there are several cases in which *d* is assimilated to *t* before an initial *t*³ but only one case in which *d* gives way to *t* before *d*. On the other hand there are instances of the change before all the initial consonants with the exception of *r*. On the whole, therefore, perhaps we should conclude that the final dental was sounded faintly or that the distinction in sound between *d* and *t* was not clearly enough marked for the careless speaker to

¹ This form and those which immediately follow have been sufficiently discussed by Diehl; cf. *De m finali epigraphica*, p. 117 f.

² It is interesting to notice in this connection that the Greek words in which final *v* is most frequently assimilated to a following consonant in the papyri are *τόν*, *τήν*, *τῶν*; *δν*, *ἥν*, *ῶν*; *ἄν*, *έάν*, *έπάρ*, *μέν*, *αὐτόν*, *τοσοῦτον*, *πλέον*; *πλήν*, and *νῦν*; cf. Mayser, *Grammatik d. gr. Papyri*, p. 231.

³ For interesting cases of this sort in MSS., cf. Heraeus, *Quaestiones criticae et palaeographicae de vetustissimis codicibus Livianis*, p. 33 f.

detect it. The reduction of *post* to *pos*, as in the MSS,¹ occurs several times, especially in the standing phrase *pos mortem*, of which there are four instances. In this connection may be mentioned the interesting forms *et ies* = *et dies* (540) and *inie* = *in die* (539). The loss of the dental in the ending *-nt* has already been mentioned (p. 77).

Under final *c* the only noteworthy thing is its omission before *t* in the phrase *in ho titulo* (494).

The facts concerning final *s* have been collected by Miss Proskauer in *Das Auslautende -s auf den lateinischen Inschriften*, and may be passed over here.

One of the clearest indications of the liaison between words which formed a sense-unit, and of the consequent phonetical changes which took place, is offered by the use of the prosthetic vowel, usually *i*, in the vulgar inscriptions. In the collections which we are discussing there are twenty-two such cases, eleven before *sp*, three each before *sc*, *sm*, and *st*, and two before simple *s*. In all but three of these cases the preceding word ends in a consonant.²

We have been examining certain points connected with the pronunciation of the word-group, and in closing this paper it may not be without interest to cite from these inscriptions a list of the groups, whose existence is revealed even to the eye by the fact that they are written as units. They are *obmerita* (P. W. 137) *exfamilia* (V. I. 530), *inie* = *in die* (539), *ex-sententia* (1299), *ommeritis* (1327), *inea aede* (1502, bis), *inse* (1509), *subcura* (1552), *centumilia* (636), *molestust* (633), *moriundust* (633), *moriendust* (634), and *hominesse* (634).

This brief study was undertaken not with the expectation of establishing in all their details the principles which govern the pronunciation of the final and the initial consonant in a word-

¹ Cf. Ritschl, *Opusc.* II. 549; Ribbeck's *Vergil*, *Prol.* 442; cf. also Stolz' *Hist. Grammatik d. lat. Sprache*, Bd. I, p. 335.

² The instances are Diehl, V. I. 46, 209, 210, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 372, 1064, 1480, 1562, 1564; Audollent, 268.1, 279.15, 244.66, 220a.4, 220b.4, 250a.17, and 253.65. For the prosthetic vowel in MSS., cf. Schuchardt, *Vokalismus II.* 338 ff. A possible case of a prosthetic vowel in vulgar Greek is furnished by the form *ἀστασίερος* = *στασίερος* in Mayser's *Grammatik d. gr. Papyri*, p. 155.

group, but rather in the hope of making a small contribution to that end. Of course the subject has a most important practical bearing on the correct reading of prose and verse, because of the very large number of cases in which within sense-units there were concurrent consonants in the situation mentioned. If these were subject to phonetical changes, our accepted method of rendering a Latin sentence would be so far removed from that of the Roman of Cicero's day that he would find it difficult to understand us. In this connection the interesting question arises whether the educated and the illiterate Roman read and spoke Latin in the same way, so far as this element in pronunciation was concerned. That educated people assimilated the final consonant to the initial consonant of the next word, in certain groups at least, seems to be clear from the statements made on this point by Cicero and Quintilian. At the same time it is highly probable that men without education, like Seleucus and Echion, for instance, in Petronius, carried the practice much farther. Of course the fact that written proof of assimilation, except as it appears in such accepted and crystallized groups as *affatim*, *illlico* and *imprimis*, is found almost entirely in illiterate inscriptions does not show that these phonetical changes took place in vulgar speech only, nor does the amount of such evidence measure the frequency of the occurrence, because everybody strove to spell in the accepted way and it is only the unconscious slips due to ignorance or absentmindedness that reveal the true state of affairs. Still, in spite of this earnest desire to spell correctly, a fair number of cases of change in the spelling has come down to us, and the significant thing is that these deviations from the accepted orthography are not haphazard, nor due in large measure to individual idiosyncrasy, but are determined by the same phonetic laws which prevail in the case of the final consonant in the first member of a compound word.¹

¹ Professor Buck has found the same principles governing consonant assimilation in external combination in the Greek inscriptions as we have tried to outline here for the vulgar Latin inscriptions. On pp. 71-72 of his *Greek Dialects* he says of changes in external combination, including elision and crasis under this head, that "the changes occur mainly between words standing in close logical relation." Later he remarks "while the less radical changes, such as the elision of a short vowel or the simpler forms of consonant assimilation, are least restricted in scope and survive the longest, the more violent forms of crasis and of con-

If we formulate the principal conclusions to which these inscriptions point—yet one does this with some diffidence—we seem to find a tendency in Latin word-groups to change final *m* to *n* before *n*, *t*, *th*, *d*, *c*, (or *k*), *q*, *s*, *f*, and *v*, a tendency to drop final *m* or *n* before a consonant in such common words as *non* and *com-* and final *m* in certain much used combinations, to change final *b* to *m* before *m*, to drop *c* in the formula *in hoc* *titulo*, to drop the dental in the ending *nt* before a consonant or at the end of a sentence, and to insert a prosthetic *i* (or *e*) after a consonant and before *sp*, *sc*, *sm*, *st*, and *s*.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

sonant assimilation are the most infrequent and the soonest given up. Thus, in the matter of consonant assimilation, the partial assimilation of a nasal to a following mute, especially a labial, as in *τὰμ πόλιν*, is very common in all dialects down to a late period and sometimes observed even in loose combinations, but examples like *τὸλ λόγον*, *τοὺν νόμον*, etc., are comparatively infrequent and practically restricted to early inscriptions. . . . There is no consistency in the spelling, even as regards the milder changes, combined and uncombined forms often standing side by side in the same inscription". Cf. p. 75 ff. and Smyth's Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects, § 411.

V.—SOBRIQUET AND STEM.

I. COMPOSITION AND SUFFIXATION: $\ddot{\delta}k^w$ - 'eye', $\ddot{\alpha}no$ - 'face'. The preconceived idea of suffixation has often made for blindness. But we now generally recognize that Lat. *ferōx* and *atrōx* are compounds with the posterius $-\ddot{\delta}k^w$ - 'looking, seeing; eye'; and that, even though the sense of the posterius is quite in the way of vanishing; cf. also *velox celox* (see § 2; and cf Kretschmer, Einl., p. 160). The same posterius is quite transparent in Greek $-\omega\pi(o)$ - in words like *olvoψ* (*οινώψ*, *οινωπός*), *γοργώψ* (*γοργωπός*), *παρθενωπός* and, with adverbial prius, in *τηλωπός* 'far-seen > distant'. Like *ferus*: *ferox* is $\delta\epsilon\omega\psi$ ($\delta\epsilon\omega\pi\omega\psi$), and the evanescence of the posterius is even greater in Hom. *στενωπός*: *στενός* (cf. *εύρωπός*, *κοιλωπός*). Again, many scholars recognize in *πρ-άνής προσηνής ἀπηνής* a posterius $-\ddot{\alpha}nes$ -: Skr. *ānā-* 'face',¹ and so they ought, cf. Lat. *prōnus* (<*pro-ānos*). Further note Skr. *sam-ānā-s* 'similis' (and almost 'aequos') <'uno-ore' (= *sam-ānana-*): Lat. (*s*)*m-ānos* 'aequos> benignus'; *imm-āni-s* 'atrox' (prius *ismo-*: Skr. *ismin-* 'rapi-dus; turbulentus', see IF. 26, 41): *ālāvāhīs* 'atrox' (prius *āsō-*: Av. *aēša-sa-*² 'petens, adoriens'); *ē-āvōs* (used of cloth), from *es(w)-* (: *ēvīs* 'bonus') + *āno-* = 'bona-facie'. Skr. *sahasānā-s* (1), with evanescent posterius, amounts to a long form of *sáhas* 'violentus' and *arçasānā-s* (2) 'iniuriosus' belongs with

¹ Boisacq's objection that *ā* is "gunated" (he means *vridhied*) *ā* is puerile. What is *ā* in *ambāges*, pray? His defense of the complicated derivation of *-ānāhīs* from *-ānes-* has no other purpose than to find an etymon for Goth. *ansts* 'gnadengabe'—which he ought to look for in Lat. <*h>**onos* (with <*h>* as in <*h>**umerus*), in the plural = 'gifts of honor' and *honestus*; also in *āvī-ānā-āui* (not *ā-vī-ānā-āui*), as Uhlenbeck has seen.

² IE. *aisosk(h)o-*, in Lat. *aeruscator* 'mendicus impudens', see CQ. 9, III, where *u* is wrongly explained as original.

³ Macdonnell, Ved. Gr. § 527, lists twelve other such forms as *s-aor.* participles. If we bear in mind that *sáhas* 'violens' also means (as a noun) 'vis', we find for over half of our list nouns in *as*, e. g. (3) *āhas* 'expectatio'. (4) *jrāyas* 'extensio, spatium', (5) *námas* 'honor', (6)

**arças* 'iniuria'. Has *veos* a similar long form in *ve-avias* (posteriorius **āniyā-* like Skr. *āsiya-m*; Lat. *ōs* 'mouth, face')? cf. Skr. *kalyāñi* (fem.) = 'lovely': *kalya-s*, *καλός* (on *η* see Wackernagel, ai. gr. I, § 173).

2. There is another group of *-āna-* compounds in the Rig-Veda, the analysis of which yields astounding results. Of the proper names, omitting *Āpnavāna-s* with its obscure prius, *Cyāv-āna-s* (one raised from the dead by the Açvins) and *Cyāvat-āna-s* seem to mean 'mobili-ore', and the priora *cyō-* and *cyāvat-* are either adjective and participial (Grundriss, 2. 1, § 313 γ) or *cyō-* is an imperative (ibid., 2. 1. 64), and *cyāvat-* a transitive participle governing the posteriorius (ibid. γ). Of the mere adjectives, *tákav-ānas* 'velox' serves as a long form to *táku-*; *vásav-āna-s* 'dives' to *vásu-* 'benignus' (*vásu-* also = 'opes', cf. *optimus*); *bhígav-āna-s* 'splendidus' to *Bhígu-* 'Splendens'. Latin *Dī-āna*, the moon goddess, may be from *diyo-āno-* 'of shining face' or, if Varro's *Divi-āna-* is not an invention, from *divi-yāna-* 'in caelo iens', cf. Skr. *divigamana-s* 'planet'.

3. But it is from the proper name *Pýthav-ānas* that we can derive most instruction, and I will make bold to say at the beginning, but deprecating any charge of insolence, that I do not write for readers who, on account of looking at the forest, refuse to look at the trees. To learn, we must seize the individual thing that seems to be true and if, tested with and by other things of its kind, it still rings true, true it must be. So I will start from the truth that seems to glare from the proper name,

Pýthav-āna-s. *Vocative origin of sobriquet compounds.*

4. The vocative *Pýthav Āna* = (O) Broad Face. Its prius, *pýthav*,¹ is the legitimate prevocalic samdhi form of *pýtho*,

bhiyás 'fear', (7) *rābhas* 'vis', (8) *çávas* 'vis'. For the others, *-as* nouns, though not of record, are perfectly legitimate formations; and *rñjas-ānā-s* 'celer' is no less apt to contain *-āna-* 'face' than Lat. *velōx* to contain *-ōkʷ-*. For *yama-sānás* 'reined up', I can but think we have a compound of *yáma-* 'rein' + *sāna-s* 'vinctus' (:vsa, in infin. *sātum*).

¹ The objection that in secondary derivation before vowel suffixes *u* stems show *av* in Sanskrit will not lie. If we may not claim the spread of *av* from cases like *Pýthav-ānas* and *tákav-ānas* (§ 2), still in derivatives like *hanavíya-* 'genuinus' (spelled *hanavyā-*), the stem *hanavi-*

vocative to *þrīhū-s* 'broad' (see Whitney, Gr². § 134, a); the second vocative *āna* is properly enclitic (*ibid.* § 314, d). The vocative *Pýtharāna*, after being used as a nominative (cf. Lat. *Jū-piter* and its likes), picked up the nominatival *-s*; and thence *pýthav-* was carried through the paradigm. Starting from a case like *Pýthav-āna-s*, where the vocative prius has the look of being an inexpugnable fact, we may infer that such compounds as *ugrá-bāhu-s* 'stout-armed' will also have started as *úgra-bāho* (O) Stout Arm; and will contain in their *ā* (< *o*) an IE. *-e*, deflected in the post tonic syllable to IE. *o*. The final accentuation of *ugrábāhu-* will be due to uncompounded *ugrám bāhūm* (acc.), cf. *urúh kákṣah* 'Broad Shoulder', to be cited presently; Lat. *os durum* (Terence, Eun. 806).

5. The notion that the Indo-European proper name represents a predominant early type of compound has often been advanced. As soon as we let such sobriquet compounds start in the vocative, where it seems that they certainly must have started, the figment of the composition stem or pre-flexional word, or *casus indefinitus* (!) in *-o* yields to the sane conviction that the *o*-stem, for all its wide subsequent development in composition, originated in a genuine and isolable word form, viz. the vocative in *-e* (deflected to *-o*). As for the typical name Broad Face (Latine, Bronze Beard), we have somehow failed¹ adequately to realize its actual vitality in our own tongue; in "Grandaddy Long Legs"; in our Texas sobriquet of "Big Foot Wallace"; in "Flat Head Mountain"; in "Faint heart ne'er won fair lady"; in Shakespeare's vocative instance, "O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome". This style of nomenclature has also been pointed out in the Rig Veda, as in *urúh kákṣah* . . . *gāngyáh* 'Latus Humerus

will lend itself to explanation as a locative (v. Macdonnell, *Ved.* Gr., § 296), cf. Lith. *danguje-jis* 'heavenly' from loc. *dangujè* (ex. ap. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1, § 66, 3). [I now realize that in Homeric *ravā-τονς* (and *ravā-ηκης*?) we have a vocative prius, while in (voc.) *Ιχθύ* *ν* may come from *əu*. So *ravav-* comes from voc. *τη-νəu*, cf. Skr. nom. *tan̄k-s*, allocated to the feminine; note *ī* in *δεκτρημα*. Likewise *ravafōs* is from *τη-νω<o>-*; cf. the suffix *-ēwo-*, set up by Brugmann-Thumb, p. 213².]

¹ But now cf. W. Petersen in *IF.* 34, 262, § 14. with a splendid list of examples.

... Gangeticus', (see Wackernagel, ai. Gram. II, 1, § 112 b, 3). We need not involve our explanation in the *pars pro toto* figure: *barefoot*, *hard heart*, and the like are more primitive than rhetoric;¹ nor limit it to names of persons (cf. Flat Head, name of a mountain).

6. A word may be added on the rôle of the nominative in making compounds. In RV. 1. 32. 6 d, the problematic *rujānās* was long ago correctly interpreted for the thought by Professor Bloomfield. Morphologically, I would compare Eng. *hump-back* and Germ. *spaltfuss*, analyzing as *rujā* 'cleft' (: ꝑƿέξ² <IE. *w̄g-* | *rug-*, see Grundriss I § 539, 3) + *nās* (: Lat. *nāres*) 'nose' (or + *ānes-* 'face', § 1). Leaving out *rujānāh*, our pada states that "Indra's enemy was crushed to pieces", and we may insert *rujānās* parenthetically as "a cleft his nose".³ In *ūrdhva*<*s*>*ānā-s* (hapax in a line with *arçusānā-s*,

¹ An overwhelming number of sobriquet compounds, exhibiting in the posterius the name of a part of the body, might doubtless be turned up in the various tongues, such words as Av. *darəgət-bəsə-* long-arm(ed), *-angušta-* 'long-thumbed', *-gava-* 'longi-manus'; *parəθu-vara-* 'broad-chested', *-safa-* 'broad-hoofed', *-sraoni-* 'broad-hipped'. In Greek we have like compounds in *-χειρ* (*κρατερό-χειρ*), *-ποντος* (*κραταλτοντος*), *-φρηγ* (*ταλαι-φρηγ*). As for the *-ai* of *ταλαιφρον* (vocative) and the *-a* of *ταλάφρων* 'stout-heart', they furnish evidence of an Indo-European vocative to *-ā* stems in *-ai* | *-ā*; the former due before consonants, the latter before vowels, but confused. This vocative prius we have in *κλιται-μῆστρα*=(O) Famous Contriver; perhaps in *μιαλ-φορε*=(O) Pollution, (O) murderer | ; in *κρατ-ποντος*=(O) hard foot (*κραται-* a vocative to the <? nom. masc. > adverbial form *κάρτα?*); in *ταλαστ-φρων* the prius will be the vocative feminine of a participle **τιλ-ητ-ι* 'ferens'. The explanations of the handbooks, as of *κραται*-from *κρατει*s and the like, are entirely artificial and have not been made even algebraically convincing.

² The river *rujānā* mentioned by the commentator on this passage may well have existed, cf. *άπο-ρρώξ*, of a branch of the Styx.

³ We also have in Sanskrit *ṝjā-nas-*=(O) Straight Nose, compounded of the *-ā* vocative **ṝju* (*ā* lengthened in composition to avoid the rhythmic succession *uuu*) + the vocative *nas*; cf. in Greek Σιλαῖός (-ο-: Skr. fem. *nās-* 'nose':: Skr. *-dā-: dās-*; cf. the *o*-stem *āγγελος*: Skr. *āngirās*, *es*-stem; and Skr. compounds with posterius in *-stha-s*: *stha-s*; also Wackernagel, ai. gram. II. 1, p. 96 a). Not Solmsen in IF. 30, 13, but Fay in CR. 18, 208, was the first to define Σιλαῖός by Snub-nose. If in the name of this Bacchic deity we are to recognize a derivative from Thracian *ȝila* 'wine' (Kretschmer, Glotta, IV. 351 sq.), he must owe his traditional facial character to what appeared to be the meaning of his name, in short to "Disease of Language."

and so liable to explanation, *< s >* and all, by momentaneous irradiation), the *< s >* may also imply a parenthesis ("upwards < was > his face"); or *-āna-* may have stood to *ūrdhvās* in a relation of "specification" (in Greek the accusative; the IE. instrumental, see *Grundriss*, 2. 2. p. 543 f.). Out of the instrumental of attendant circumstance, as e. g. in Latin *mulier formā honestā*, the possessive (*Bahuvrihi*) type of compound might also have developed; cf. in reversed order *Skr. jānv-ākná-* (with) 'knee-bent'. The two lines of development would have converged. The course of the development from the sobriquet compound can be very simply comprehended by looking at a few Sanskrit compounds with prius *ugrá-*: (1) *ugrá-bāhu-* Strong Arm; (2) *ugra-dhanvan-* 'strong-bowed', *ugrá-yudha-* 'strong-weaponed'; (3) *ugrá-sena-* 'strong-armied', *ugrá-vīra-* 'strong-heroed', *ugrá-putra-* 'strong-sonned'; (4) *ugratejas-* 'strong-energied'.

7. In the Avesta, the prius of similar compounds is often in the nominative: does that point to the fact that the nominative, and not the vocative, was the generalized form, at least in *o*-stems? For Sanskrit *ugrá-bāhus*, the vocative *ugra bāho* has dictated the form of the prius; but in the Avesta we have in *darago-bāzu-* the type of the *Skr.* nominative *ugró bāhú-s* (like *urúh kakṣáh*, § 5).

8. The arguments advanced above seem to me to have made it abundantly probable that the non-isolable stem which serves as the prius of composition originated in the vocative—or also to a much less degree in some other case form—of a sobriquet group. If this be true, while the developed facts of grammar as regards composition remain untouched, our conception of the fabric of the word must be profoundly modified. Thus we may no longer speak of the vocative of the *o* and *ā* declensions as the unmodified stem, but say contrariwise that the stem is the vocative. And the source of the vocatival *-ē* seems a thing we can come upon. As the augment, *ē-* is an almost isolable word, and meant 'there!' (? or 'here'; cf. *Drewitt*, *CQ*. VI, 44 sq.; *ē-θēλω*). The same exclamatory adverb *-ē* makes an ideal vocative indicator, as anybody knows who has ever sung out "*you-there!*" to the man of unknown name whose attention is wanted quickly from the next tennis court. This *ē* (in the long form *ē*) is also used as a preposition; and when

Brugmann (Gr. 2. 2. § 634) explains it as instrumental of the demonstrative stem *e* he is confounding an original local adverb (without case) with that much subsequent thing a case form¹: and it really is this *-ē* that becomes the casual suffix of the Indo-Iranian instrumental in *-ā*. In the pair *ōψē* | *ōψi*- the same *-ē* competes with *-i* (cf. *ōψi*) as an adverb determinant.—For the identification of vocativeal *ē* with *-ē* in the imperative see e. g. AJPh. 15, 413; and on *ei* 'there'! Bull. Univ. Texas, no. 263, § 99 sq. On *-ē*¹ as the instrumental case ending cf. AJPh. 37, 167²; as the locative, 170, § 28.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, Nov. 8, 1915.

¹ He who thinks that IE. *ē* 'there' is a merely glottogonic inference and instrum. *ē* something less glottogonic—has never thought!

ADDENDA.

§ 1. The Latin pair *vetus*: *veter-ānus* conforms precisely with the type of Skr. *sáhas-*: *sahas-ānā-*.

§ 1, fn. 3. Cf. *r̥si-sāṇa-* (RV.), attached to a seer.

P. 85, fn. 1. In the Vedic proper names and epithets *Háray-āṇa-*, Tawny Face (quasi Atrox); *Tūrvay-āṇa-*, Mighty Face (quasi Ferox); and *Ahray-āṇa-*, Unabashed Face, *ay* in the priora is the samdhi form of the *e* (=IE. *ei/oi*) vocative of *hári-* *tūrvi-* *ā-hri-*.

§ 8. Thus Lat. *puer-e* may be conceived as like our outcry "boy there!"

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Greek and Roman Mythology. By Wm. SHERWOOD FOX.

Pp. lxii and 354; plates LXIII; illustrations in text 11.
Boston, 1916. \$6.00 net.

This is the first of twelve volumes on the Mythology of All Races, an undertaking on a comprehensive plan but not intended to take the place of special dictionaries, nor to make detailed study of comparative mythology nor, primarily, to illustrate art and archæology. A thirteenth volume will contain a general index.

This volume by Professor Fox, granted the purpose of the author—with which there is no reason to quarrel,—is admirably executed. Whatever criticism may be suggested in his handling of the voluminous material accumulated for Greek Mythology will be mainly superficial or, occasionally, a question of proportion, or due to some personal equation on the part of a critic.

The author states (p. xxi) that his purpose is “to present and interpret a number of typical myths of Greece and Rome as vehicles of religious thought; that is to say, in the discharge of their original function”. This precludes any demand for encyclopaedic data on all details of all myths. His illustration both of literature and of art is incidental and secondary. Here and there some readers will wish that space occupied with the rehearsal of some familiar story could have been matched with more details of a less familiar one. We might, for example, desire more about Charon; yet even here the author inserts,¹ in notes and appendix, suggestive interpretation doubtless new to many readers.

In his Introduction (pp. lvii–lix) Professor Fox gives a satisfactory synopsis of eleven “Methods of Interpreting Myths” with a fuller explanation of his own method and his purpose, above cited.

¹ Perhaps it might not be too much of a “sop to Cerberus” nor too wide an incursion into the domain of comparative literature if the interesting paragraph (Appendix, p. 314) on the Modern Greek Charondas as Lord of the Dead and on the interlocking functions of Charon, Hermes, and Hades, were supplemented with the denaturalizing of Yama in Sanscrit. In the Rig-Veda Yama, the not unkindly *ψυχοπομός*, is the first to find out for men the ancient pathway to the refuge “where long ago our fathers have gone onward”, while the later Mahabharata knows him only as the cruel, blood-red god of death.

Throughout the book the reader is conscious of deliberate and necessary repression, not of any inadvertence. We are not left in doubt, for example, as to the underlying-mortgage indebtedness to totemism and cult, (cf. pp. xliii–xlvi; 183–185; 215–221; 287) but the author realizes that, after all, his business is not with the inchoate and primitive but with the Greek itself. We are concerned with the emergence out of animism into deism. He refuses to muddy the pool by a continual stirring of the sediment albeit he, and we, may be conscious that the clear water, here and there, is stained to darker colours by the rotting leaves and snaky slime below. This, indeed, gives clarity to his treatment of the lowlier aspects of Greek religion as in the chapter on: "The Lesser Gods of Water, Wind and Wild", where he braves, as elsewhere, the possible criticism of more myopic scholarship and quotes, as an illuminating vignette, from Moody's *Fire-Bringer*: "The woven sounds | Of small and multitudinous lives" that people "the grasses and the pools with joy".

The treatment of the Greek myths is arranged in two parts: Part I. Myths of the Beginning, the Heroes, and the After-world—in nine chapters, including three chapters handling topographically, as is convenient, the Peloponnesus, the Northern Mainland, Crete, and Attica; Part II contains fourteen chapters on the Greek Gods, including The Greater Gods, the Lesser Gods, and Abstract Divinities.

To analyse in detail the advantages of this orderly arrangement is out of the question, but the actual treatment is replete with suggestiveness, chapter by chapter. The following notes, taken almost at random, may illustrate. The parvenu Zeus and his party on Olympus were the "first properly to be called gods (p. 8)". Their elder rivals made a last stand farther south on Mount Othrys against—(May we not assume?)—the encroachments of the Achaean invasion. So, in connection with Prometheus (p. 13) it is well to be reminded that not until the fifth century B. C. did the belief that man was shaped from clay become general. With this also compare his equation (p. 21) of "cherchez la femme" with the story of Pandora. "The first *woman* was always believed to be the handiwork of gods." Hesiod's interruption of the sequence of the Ages of the Metals by the intrusive Age of Heroes is "clumsy" (p. 18). Ovid does better with his version, where the flood of Deucalion gives us a convenient "Schwamm darüber", and in the lively stones which repeople a drowned world we are more at liberty to identify the Men of Stone, ready for a fresh start.

Argos by its physical situation "lay all Danaë" to external influences (if we may mutilate the poet's phrase) and Mr. Fox suggests neatly in an opening paragraph the contact with the

Aegeans while keeping unhampered his proper treatment of the "nucleus of native Argive myth".

In like manner the brief introduction to Attica puts the reader in a receptive condition to realize, *inter alia*, why Theseus developed as a replica to Heracles. "The body of Attic myth is a relatively late creation. . . . There is a great gulf, as yet only precariously bridged, between the historical cults of Attike and the earliest period of which we have any religious remains" (p. 66).

In this connection the full and admirable treatment (Chapters VII and VIII) of "The Voyage of the Argo" and "The Tale of Troy" (including the setting from the Earlier Cyclic poets to the Teleogonia) make the student of literature wish for (though he cannot demand) a pronouncement on puzzling readjustments involved in a belief that the Argonautic expedition is the actual progenitor of the *Odyssey* as being a disingenuous palimpsest using, without erasing, some of the original lines.

In Part II Professor Fox obtains his list of "The Greater Gods" by combining the Homeric, Athenian, and Olympian systems, omitting from the latter Cronus, Rhea, Alpheus, and the Charites. Thanks to his repression of the incidental and his emphasis on the vital, the individual gods, greater and lesser, emerge in clearer form to the reader.

Zeus, he tells us on p. 161, was so much "the most ethical of all the gods of the pantheon, that he almost shrank the Greek polytheism to monotheism. . . . While Zeus was the bringer of evil as well as of good into the life of men, occasionally the Greeks rose to the noble idea that he was above all that was evil". Inasmuch as other writers on Greek religion sometimes fail to emphasize this we might wish that our author had found space to add that this conception is urged by Aeschylus, long before Plato, especially as he presently refers to Aeschylus as partly hampered by the post-Homeric doctrine of the Three Fates. For example, in the *Agamemnon* (176 ff.), in his *πάθος—μάθος*, there is outlined a Zeus, omniscient, potent, and benevolent, educating good from evil:

Zeus it was who built for mortals
Highway unto Wisdom's portals
When he made the law abide:
Who would *know* must *woe* betide.

The treatment of Hera is particularly suggestive. Athena, likewise, is treated with clarity and we are especially grateful for the substitution (Plate XL) of a more worshipful Virgin for the usual stumpy caricature (as we are fain to believe) of the famous Athena Parthenos. On this (Frankfort) figure the

warrior helmet seems none too oppressive a weight for the inventive brain of the self-possessed maiden.

The chapter on Artemis skilfully presents her motley interests in maieutic, magic, *materia medica*, as well as her more familiar menagerie. It is a far cry from the hybrid Great Mother to the chaste huntress, but Mr. Fox is frank enough to hint that her "almost Pharisaic patronage of the precocious Hippolytus" and other similar data were "comparatively late attempts to cloak an originally unmoral character". However that may be, we are glad to have the central idea of our "Lady of the Beasts" represented by the lovely and none too familiar Munich statue (Plate XLII) with its reminder of Anacreon's beautiful hymn. As to her own inoculation against Eros we are willing to accept Lucian's homœopathic explanation: *ἴδιον τύπα ἔρωτα ἔρα*.

The author's judicious caution in dealing with doubtful etymologies may be illustrated by his reference to Amphitrite—the earth-encompassing sea (p. 214): "We can merely divine, rather than prove, that (her name) refers to this feature of her nature". On the other hand the derivation (p. 221) of Lenaea from *ληγαναῖς* as the "feast of wild women" may seem like an *hysteron proteron* to some who have trod only the familiar *ληρός*.

Professor Fox's method of treating individual divinities may be illustrated by his sub-topics on Dionysus. 1. The Origin and Name of Dionysus; 2. Dionysus in Homer; 3. Birth of Dionysus; 4. The Functions and Cult of Dionysus; 5. Dionysus in Art; 6. Myths of Alexander the Great. Not a few readers will find the picture of the wine-god incised with firmer lines after reading this orderly and suggestive sketch. Naturally he does not treat all divinities under so many headings, but categories 1 and 5 are more or less constant and it is of importance, in seeking to understand the development of Greek religion, to be told that Dionysus is an "outlander" and Demeter an Hellenic goddess. Incidentally, Demeter as mother of Plutus, and Plutus the son of Eirene would involve the pacifist equation: Peace = the Giver of Grain.

To Part III, "The Mythology of Ancient Italy", only twenty-one pages are allotted and this may seem strange to critics who form a judgment from the Table of Contents. In addition, however, to obvious inclusion of much Greek material in Latin literature and the ready-made identifications of similar attributes, the author, in explaining the dearth of Roman myth (p. 287-88) emphasizes a real dissimilarity between the two peoples. "The mind of the Italian was not naturally curious and speculative, whence, since speculation is the motive power behind myth, the output of Italic myth was very small, and at the same

time well-nigh barren of lively fancy. . . . Only the barest few of the *numina* did he (the Roman) endue with the many-coloured coat of personality; all others he left in the plain, rustic garb of functional spirits of nature. . . . While the Greek mind easily and naturally emerged from animism into deism, the Roman found the utmost difficulty."

The Italic matter actually given is, however, so good that we wish that it might have been expanded—for example, the hints at Etruscan mythology; the Italic gods Consus, Ops, Faunus, etc.; the Momentary and Departmental gods; the equations and dissimilarities of Greek and Roman gods. Thus of Fortuna he says (p. 295): "Her Greek counterpart was Tyche, rarely Moira". In Appendix II is contained: "Survivals of Divinities and Myths of the Etruscans and Romans in Romagnola".

The sixty-three plate illustrations are generally exceedingly good and clear—those from vase paintings perhaps more satisfying than some few of the statuary. The accompanying descriptions are usually very full. The choice of illustrations shows careful consideration, laying under contribution a wide range of less familiar material, as already indicated. One mechanical defect, doubtless forced on the author by the procrustean habits of publishers, is that some of the plates are far removed from the text that they illustrate and are without cross-reference in the text to warn the reader that he is losing, as he reads, an illuminating illustration. Thus the Madrid Athena (three views) is set at p. 14 instead of illustrating pp. 170–173.

In the present strained condition of interlinguistic comity the author is, of course, well within his rights in using the current transliteration of the original Greek and Latin spelling, although we sincerely deprecate this growing dislocation of English usage as being unnecessary for scholars and a stumbling-block to the non-professional reader. Mr. Fox concedes a little to usage long naturalized in English and writes, for example, Apollo and Achilles. By the same act of amnesty Attike, Delphoi and various others might well have retained their English uniform.

We have noted only the following misprints: p. xxxviii, near end, "3. Mystic Rite at Eleusis" is an anticipation of the next line; p. 55 the apostrophe is transposed (and spelling abbreviated) in Kallirhoe's; at p. 212, on fly-leaf explanatory of Plate XLVII, read p. 6 for "p. 7"; on p. 219 *oīvos* is aspirated.

The book closes with a generous bibliography of 18 pages. As an antidote for M. Bérard's theory of Phaeacia there might be added: P. Champault, Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie, d'après l'Odyssée, Paris, 1906.

A special index for this volume, unfortunately excluded by the general plan, would have enhanced its usefulness; even the full Table of Contents is not adequate for ready reference and

Vol. XIII, when completed, will not be under the same cover.

But even a reviewer, committed in some sort to microscopic criticism, can only feel grateful to the author's skilful hermeneutic for, like Hermes in the Homeric Hymn, Mr. Fox unlocks the treasure and illustrates

"the birth
Of the bright Gods and the dark desert Earth."

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

Shaksperian Studies. By Members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University. Edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS and ASHLEY HORACE THORNDIKE, New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. 452 pp.

This volume of essays by the professors of a single department in a single university is one of the most noteworthy productions occasioned by the Shakspere tercentenary. The book is large and illuminative, but it lays no claim to being exhaustive or systematic. As the prefatory note to the work states, "no effort has been made to conform the essays to a general plan or to harmonize conflicting opinions". The productions thus rather loosely brought together are, for the most part, fairly short and general; the volume contains no index, no bibliography, and only an occasional footnote; and the majority of the essays, instead of being composed by specialists in Elizabethan literature, are written by men who have made their reputations as students of such subjects as American literature, composition, and Anglo-Saxon.

Obviously the intention of the editors was to bring together a group of papers that would be readable and suggestive rather than scholarly, as the term is usually understood; hence the reader who consults Shaksperian Studies with the purpose of finding new "facts" about Shakspere or of studying the detailed solution of specific problems will be disappointed, but he who wishes to read a series of highly interesting discussions of a large number of subjects connected with the great dramatist and his art will welcome the book edited by Professors Matthews and Thorndike. That the subjects treated in the eighteen papers are as varied as they are interesting, is obvious, for matters are handled so widely different as Elizabethan pronunciation and the directions for extracting the boyish qualities in Shakspere's plays for enthusiastic presentation by present-day preparatory students. On the basis of subject-matter the

eighteen studies may be roughly classified as follows: five deal with Shakspere's treatment of his sources; three are character studies; two are really running discussions of specific types of Shaksperian criticism; two, by professors in Teachers College, discuss Shakspere in our modern schools; and one paper deals with each of the following topics: Shakspere's pronunciation, the text of *Pericles*, Shaksperian stage traditions, the history play, New York productions of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakspere's comments on his art.

It is obviously impossible to discuss here each of the eighteen essays contained in the volume. A few, however, deserve especial mention. Professor Matthews' *Shaksperian Stage Traditions* is unusually interesting and suggestive in its plea that the large number of gestures and stage-business interpretative of various passages in Shakspere's plays—the contributions, for the most part, of generations of actors and stage managers—be preserved by some future editor of Shakspere, just as Regnier in his edition of Molière's *Tartuffe* has set down in connection with the dialogue the best of the stage traditions preserved by the *Comédie Française*. The industrious student could no doubt trace at least a few of these traditions back to the very time of Shakspere himself. Such would be of vital importance, especially to the student, for, after all, no matter how much some of Shakspere's creatures have been transformed as the result of changes in morals and ways of thinking, the present-day scholar is chiefly interested in finding out, if possible, how such characters as Shylock and Hamlet and Henry V were acted and understood in the Elizabethan period.

Professor Brewster's *The Restoration of Shakspere's Personality* is an acute discussion of the dangers encountered by the critic who attempts to reconstruct Shakspere the man out of materials contained in his poems and plays. The paper is full of common sense, but the style will possibly irritate certain present-day champions of the early Victorians and of the German "discoverers" of Shakspere.

Professor Lawrence's *The Love Story in Troilus and Cressida* will probably appeal to some as being the most suggestive paper in the series, although it is really a more detailed treatment of one point brought out in two recent studies by Professor J. S. P. Tatlock—*The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood* (P. M. L. A., Dec., 1915) and *The Chief Problem in Shakespeare* (*Sewanee Review*, April, 1916). These three papers should be read together, for they offer by far the most satisfactory attempt that has yet been made to solve what has been called the "chief problem in the greatest body of poetry in the world". *Troilus and Cressida*, instead of being a burlesque of Homer, a satire of rival poets, or the pessimistic performance of a man disappointed in

love or something else, is a play dealing in a realistic and conventional manner with the Trojan story at a time when the Homeric heroes were not especially venerated and when Pandarus and Cressida, whose conduct was in accord with the best usage advocated by the medieval system of courtly love, had degraded into wantons in consequence of a change in the standards of morality. Finally Professor Cunliffe's explanation of the widely different interpretations of the character of Henry V offered by the Elizabethan and our own age should be read as another instance of the necessity of knowing the temper and ideals of the Elizabethan period before attempting to discuss Shakspere's characters; and Shakspere as a Debtor and The Question of Shakspere's Pronunciation, by Professors Thorndike and Ayres respectively, while necessarily brief and general, are obviously written by men who have a large and intimate knowledge of their subjects.

As would be expected in a book like *Shaksperian Studies*, some of the papers are not so satisfactory. Two or three are a trifle thin, and it is difficult to see just how A Note On the History Play, interesting as it may be in itself, can be classified as a "Shaksperian study". In the opinion of the reviewer, the first part of Reality and Inconsistency in Shakspere's Characters could well be condensed; the extravagant praise of Julius Caesar in the essay dealing with the sources of that play will no doubt impress some as being the work of a writer who is unduly saturated with modern realism in his discussion of the highly conventional and poetic drama of the Elizabethan period; and the essay entitled Shakspere on His Art seems to be an extensive tabulation that really arrives at no definite and noteworthy conclusion.

Again, the book as a whole would have been improved by a little more scholarly attention to details. A few references are vague and incomplete (pp. 320-21), the reader is never told the date of the first American edition of Shakspere (cf. p. 348), the form *Shakspere* is used even in titles of books and articles whose authors employed the longer form *Shakespeare*—a case of consistency which may not be acceptable to some of the authors concerned, and which certainly will not meet the approval of the author of *The Name of William Shakespeare* (Philadelphia, 1906). Possibly, too, some of the more squeamish scholars may object to the quotations (pp. 67, 75) from the Everyman editions of Coleridge and Hazlitt.

In addition to its subject-matter, *Shaksperian Studies* is noteworthy from another point of view. With the exception of a similar series of studies got out by the Department of English at the University of Wisconsin, it is, so far as I know, the only volume published by members of a single English or American university as a part of the Shakspere tercentenary. That such

a satisfactory collection of essays was produced by the professors of one department in one institution is not only a striking testimonial of the competency of that department, but is significant evidence of the important position which Shakspeare occupies in the educational system of our best universities.

T. S. GRAVES.

TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

Une statistique de locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale, by M. ÉDOUARD CUQ. Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Tome XL, 1915.

Nothing that M. Édouard Cuq says can pass unnoticed. In the present work he devotes 61 pages to a question which Roman topographers have argued and pondered over, but for which no better answers have been forthcoming than those given by Preller and by Richter. The question turns on the meaning of the word *insula* as used in that interesting document called the *Notitia* (c. 334 A. D.) or *Curiosum urbis Romae regionum XIV* (c. 357 A. D.), from which calculations have been made as to the population of Rome in the time of Constantine.

The text reads—*Insulae per totam urbem XLVI.DCI, domus M.DCCXC*, which gives for the fourteen regions of Rome 46,602 insulae, and 1,790 domus. There is little discussion about the domus, it is the insula which needs interpretation. Dureau de la Malle first explained an insula as a *taberna*, then Preller guessed that it meant a room, and then Richter brought forward the theory that it meant a rented floor in a house, identifying insula with *coenaculum*. M. Cuq takes the citations from the *Digest* and the inscriptions which Richter uses to prove his contention, shows how they do not apply, and then demolishes his argument by the citations from *Labeo*, *Papinian*, and *Gaius* on *superficies solo cedit* which prove that Roman law knew no such thing as house ownership by floors.

The constructive part of M. Cuq's argument begins with page 27. He shows that the insula as interpreted in the *XII Tables* was, like an island, a house with an imprescriptible *ambitus* all about it; that it lost its insularity because of increasing land values as shown by the growth of the *jus projiciendi* and *jus oneris ferendi*; that many neighboring houses or houses with party-walls began in the last century of the Republic to come into the ownership of individuals like *Crassus*; and that in the early empire, although there is an exceptional use of the word *insula* as an annex to a *domus*, the *insula* became an apartment

house. The next step is to show that there was more than one apartment on a floor, and that each apartment had a separate stair or entrance. This M. Cuq does both from legal citations, and from actual houses existing in Pompeii and Ostia, and *ovovixia* in Delos. The *insularius*, or *aedium custos*, of the time of Cicero, is next taken under consideration. It is shown that he had charge of the renting of the apartments, and the collection of rents, being given through his master or patron the legal right of *perclusio* in case of non-payment of rent. By the time of Nero the word *insularius* had come to mean the renter of an apartment, and this came to be the accepted use of the word as shown in an imperial rescript of the third century and in the Digest, where among other passages, the jurisconsult Paul (D. 1, 15, 3, 4) interprets the word *insularius* by *inquilinus*. The word *insula* in the third century came to have two meanings, that of an entire apartment house, or from a narrower administrative point of view, that of a single apartment.

The interdict *de migrando*, the right of *perclusio*, the action *de effusis et deiectis*, are enough to prove the restrictions put on *insularii*. But it is still necessary to show that a single apartment, an *insula*, is an administrative unit. Suetonius (Divus Iulius, 41) says: *Recensum populi nec more nec loco solito, sed vicatim per dominos insularum egit* (Italics are mine). Augustus made a change when he established the 14 administrative regions, and finally in 223 A. D. the matter of the census was put in charge of the *praefectus vigilum*. Statistics of the inhabitants of apartments were necessary to fix the *origo*, to apply the rule *actor sequitur forum rei*, to collect the tax on rents (Suetonius, Nero 44: *Inquilinos privatarum aedium atque insularum pensionem annuam repraesentare fisco (iussit)*), to fix properly the *ius liberorum*, and to dispense the *tesserae frumentariae*. Therefore the *praefectus vigilum* had to have on hand a list of all apartments for there were always questions coming up concerning the responsibility for fires, for non-payment of rents, for attempted dispossession or removal, and the *praetor urbanus* needed the same list of apartments to settle cases which arose from accidents resulting from things falling on passers-by from balconies or windows. In the registers of the magistrates therefore apartments were distinct administrative units.

M. Cuq has brought to the solution of this question of the *insulae* a fine array of legal and inscriptional evidence. He has overturned previous conflicting theories, and has built up a new theory which fits his foundations. Measured by preconceptions which have identified the *insulae* with the population of Rome, his theory would be of no use at all, but in his last paragraph M. Cuq says the numbers in the *Curiosum* can not be used to

calculate the population of Rome, for they are nothing but the administrative statistics of the police magistrates. Certainly it will be difficult to prove that statement untrue.

R. V. D. MAGOFFIN.

Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo—Osservazioni e Confronti (Estratto dagli Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, vol. LI). By ERORE STAMPINI. Turin, Bocca, 1916. Pp. 48.

One who has had the fortune, as I have had, to collate about 100 of the 120 known MSS of Catullus and to study collations of most of the others may be pardoned a little impatience, albeit sympathetic, at the scantiness of the material with which Stampini had to work in the treatise under discussion. With copious material at one's disposal many questions that seem very difficult find an easy solution. The only MS actually examined by Stampini was the Brescia MS. G and M were studied in the unsatisfactory published facsimiles, the other MSS were known only through the collations in various editions, notably that of Ellis, which is full of errors of omission and commission. Stampini knew only a part of the few published readings of R, which is really the key that unlocks the mysteries of the minor MSS. He might have found more in Hale's various articles and especially in my dissertation on the Identification of the MSS of Catullus Cited by Statius in his Edition of 1566 (1908). Nor apparently was any use made of Merrill's Catullus, which contains a good independent collation of O. But let it be said at once that despite these handicaps, Stampini has done remarkably well, though I can not agree with him in all things. The Brescia MS is one of the few that I did not myself collate, but I examined a collation of it. I recall that I considered it a close relative of Harleianus 2574 (Ellis' h). Stampini has made the same observation, and in fact calls the two MSS twins. But when Stampini goes farther and asserts that these two MSS have readings which are "good and certain and which are not found in other MSS", that their common parent had "an individuality of its own independent of O as well as of every other MS of Catullus", that there was a "tradition of the text independent of G and R as of O", I can not follow him. Such are in brief his chief conclusions. Let us examine a few details.

First of all it seems quite unnecessary to go into such detail as Stampini does in describing Br (as he calls the Brixianus),

especially in the matter of abbreviations. He is of course right in assuming that no inferences can be drawn from Ellis' apparatus about the abbreviations in *h*. What critical apparatus would pretend to reproduce faithfully all abbreviations of minor MSS? The statement that the importance of *D* has been exaggerated gives great satisfaction, though it would be better to say that it has no importance whatever. Stampini gives a list of 220 readings peculiar to *Br* and *h*. The list would of course be greatly reduced after a comparison with complete collations of all existing MSS. But as said above, I agree with Stampini in grouping the two MSS together. His suggestion that the common parent of the two is still in existence seems doubtful. I know of no MS that could qualify for the position. Though Stampini gives various lists of readings of *Br* to show that it agrees now with *O*, now with *G*, etc., I can not see that these prove his contention that *Br* and *h* belong to a tradition independent of *O*, *G* and *R*. The fact that *Br* and *h* at times agree with *O* against the other reported MSS is interesting, but probably shows merely that readings from *O* were transferred to some ancestor of *Br* and *h*. The similarity to *O* on the part of these two MSS was known to me and is not peculiar to them. I can not elaborate here on the relation of these two MSS to others.

Stampini expresses a profound conviction that when all the MSS of Catullus will be carefully studied confirmation will be found of the strong suspicion to which the examination of *Br* and *h* led him, that there exists a tradition of the text independent of *OGR*, though admitting that the present slight knowledge of *R* makes certainty impossible. On the other hand I should express the strong conviction, based on my study of practically all the existing MSS of Catullus, including *R*, that *Br* and *h* do not belong to an independent tradition, though admitting that there is a very remote possibility that they do. Stampini seems not to know that Hale has a complete set of collations of Catullus MSS (see *Cl. Phil.* 3.233); he does not even mention Hale's name, though he apparently attributes a high value to *R*, discovered by Hale.

B. L. ULLMAN.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XXXVIII (1914).

Observations sur l'emploi de l'infinitif historique (5-26). Georges Romain continues his studies on the infinitive (A. J. P. XXXV. 346), noting only usage and manner of rendering. The historical infinitive always expresses a consequence, and depends on a previous proposition, express or implied. The author finds but one exception, Ter. Andr. 368-9, and here he suspects the text. The h. i. has an ingressive signification, expresses new ideas, is not equivalent to the historical present, as Kuehner says, nor the Greek aorist, as Jaenicke claims, nor the historical perfect, as Barbelenet says, nor the imperfect, as the wrongly interpreted Priscian passage (XVIII, 4, 48, p. 228 Keil) has been supposed to prove, but has no temporal signification, except as it represents the time of the verb of the expression on which it depends.

Un fragment sur papyrus de la chronique d'Hippolyte de Rome (27-31). D. Serruys identifies a papyrus published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908 (Oxyr. Papyr. VI, p. 176, no. 870) as part of a *διαμερισμὸς γῆς* in the Chronicon of Hippolytos, and shows that his work had great vogue in the Orient.

Les prétoiriens de Vitellius. Notes exégétiques sur plusieurs passages des Histoires de Tacite (32-75). Philippe Fabia comments on 8 passages from the Historiae. (1) II, 66-67: *Angebant-loquebantur*. Tacitus might better have written *victi exercitus* than *victarum legionum*, because Otho's army was partly legionary, partly pretorian. The pretorians were punished by Vitellius, not for their infidelity to Galba, but because of their fidelity to Otho. (2) II, 92-94; (3) III, 41; (4) III, 58; (5) III, 61-63; (6) III, 67-73, 78-85, IV, 1: Tacitus speaks of *Vitelliani*, *Vitellianus miles*, *miles Vitellii*, and once *Germanicae cohortes*, but never calls them pretorians. *Germani* not to be confused with *Germanici*. (7) III, 57, 76-77, 81, IV, 2; (8) IV, 46: Praetorianam-retinenda erat, three categories of applicants for pretorians under Vespasian. V. finally reduced them to nine cohorts, as under Augustus, by *honesta missio*, and *missio ignominiosa*, but *alii ob culpam, sed carptim ac singuli*. The article is a running commentary on the text, the views of Ritter and Valmaggi meeting frequent approbation or criticism.

Le texte de Polybe VI, 19, 2 et la durée du service militaire à Rome (76-80). E. Cavaignac, by a study of the number of citizens available for military service, reinforces the argument of Steinwender for keeping ξ in Polybius VI, 19, 2 for the number of years which citizens were obliged to serve as infantry.

Notes critiques sur les Bucoliques de Virgile (81-92). L. Havet thinks for reasons both stichometric and sense-making that a line has fallen out between 1, 68 and 1, 69, and proposes <Aspiciam? aut ego hyperboreo flavesce sole>. H. adds a commendatory letter from C. Jullian. In 3, 102 the author commends the explanation of Donatus of *his*, adding that *his* is not only the oldest Vergilian example of the nom. plu. of *hic*, but, according to his belief, the oldest example in classic poetry. 8, 17 and 30 show Vergil to have been inspired by two astral reminiscences which are incompatible with astronomical facts. 8, 50: Havet proposes a question mark at end of l. 49, a semi-colon after *puer*, and *sic* instead of *tu* in l. 50. 10, 1 should read *Extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborum.*

Aesch. Eum. 506 sqq. (93-96). H. Grégoire claims to have discovered the solution which Wecklein hints at in his 1888 edition: <Σ>πεύσται, κτλ.

Euripide, Ion, v. 1424 (97). J. E. Harry would read τόδ' ξσθ' ὑφασμάτων'. ἀ τ' ἐσπάθας εὐρίσκομεν (codd.: ὑφασμα θέσθαθ' ως), saying that τεσταθας became τεσταθως and then θεσθαθ' ως.

Notes critiques (98-113). René Waltz offers various emendations in Seneca, Tacitus, and Petronius. Seneca, Epist. ad Lucilium II, 3: Nihil—transfertur, W. proposes to insert *multa* before temptantur. III, 3: Epistulas—dicimus, *sic priore* ought to be *secretiore*. IV, 2: et hoc quidem peior est, quod etc., Hense's addition of *res* after *peior* is unnecessary. IV, 3: Intelleges—transeat, *malum* magnum instead of *nullum* magnum. V, 2: Asperum—evita, Gertz' conjecture to be disregarded. VIII, 5: Domus—corporis, read *corpori*. IX, 11: Non dubie—adfectus, last phrase should not be punctuated with an interrogation mark. IX, 17: Quamdiu—victurus, punctuation needs to be changed. IX, 18: Omne—insequitur, *Stilbon*—*insequitur* to be considered a gloss. XVIII, 4: Hoc multo—facere, *nec* misceri should be *sed* misceri. XVIII, 11: Sepositos—timendum sit, for *decretis* read *secretis*. XX, 11: Nescio—aestimanda est, for *angulus si* read *an gulosus*. XXXIII, 7: Hoc Zenon—profer, for *moveris* read *merebis*. XXXIX, 3: Quemadmodum—motu est, consider *non magis quam quiescere* a gloss. XLI, 7: Vitem—deducit, consider *eorum quae tulit* a gloss to explain *pondere*. XLV, 8: Ceterum—persuaseris, read *ut nesciat, ut tu illi . . .*. XLVII, 5: Alia interim—infelix, change the semi-colon after *abutimur* to a comma, and

sense is clear. XLVIII, 3: Haec societas—homine, for *omnes* hominibus read *omnibus* hominibus. De otio III, 3: Si res-publica—impendet, for *osculata* read *obscurata*. De tranquillitate animi XVI, 1: Ubi . . . cogitur—palam facere. W. defends ms. reading. Tacitus, Annales XIII, 26: Ille—adversos, W. changes his suggestion (Rev. de Phil. XXIX, p. 52) of fieret *egit* for fieret *ut* to fieret *retulit*, saying that the copyist forgot to repeat *ret* and reduced *ulit* to *ut*. XIV, 16: Ne tamen—supplere, for *aetatis nati* read *aetate: nam* ii. XIV, 60: His quanquam—Octaviam, for *his quanquam* read *haudquaquam*. XV, 62: Quando—latuos, for constantis amicitiae latuos read *constanti amicitiae daturos*. Petronius, Satirae 28: Tres—dicebat, for hoc suum propinasse read hoc *solum* propinasse. 30: Rettulimus—poenam, for in precario read in *proedrio*.

Bulletin bibliographique (114-135). M. Besnier, Lexique de géographie ancienne (V. Chapot). Fr. Fischer, Thucydidis reliquiae in papyris et membranis Aegyptiacis servatae (C. Michel). W. Norvin, Olympiodori philosophi in Platonis Phaedonem commentaria (A. Diès). K. Jander, Oratorum et rhetorum fragmenta nuper reperta (G. Mathieu). O. Kern, Inscriptiones graecae, Fasc. 7 of Tabulae (B. H(aussoullier)). E. Nachmanson, Historische att. Inschriften, Fasc. 110 of Kleine Texte; Historische gr. Inschriften bis auf Alex. d. gr., Fasc. 121 of Kl. Texte; F. Bleckmann, Gr. Inschriften zur gr. Staatenkunde (G. Mathieu). H. Usener, Kleine Schriften, IV, Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte (R. D. de Lageneste). S. Reinach, Cornélie ou le Latin sans pleurs; Sidonie ou le Français sans peine (P. L(ejay)). J. de Decker, Juvenalis declamans; Studies in Philology Vol. X, Univ. of N. Car.; J. Hunger & H. Lamer, Altorientalische Kultur im Bilde (J. Marouzeau). Ed. Norden, Agnóstos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede; W. Riepl, Das Nachrichtenwesen des Altertums; Fr. Fessler, Benutzung d. philosophischen Schriften Ciceros durch Lactanz; S. Abercii vita, Th. Nissen, ed.; Sancti Benedicti regula monachorum, D. C. Butler, ed. (P. Lejay). Ausgewählte Komödien d. P. Terentius Afer. Vol. I. Phormio, E. Hauler (G. Ramain).

Les personnages épisodiques dans l'Andrienne de Térence (137-150). H. de La Ville de Mirmont finds that Terence first put a real libertus, Sosia, on the Roman stage, and was the first to introduce, not create, a sage-femme part, and he compares Lesbia to Mrs. Gamp.

Notes sur l'Hélène d'Euripide (151-162). H. Grégoire offers the following emendations: I, for *πειθεῖς ἑροίεις*, l. 391, try *παις Διὸς ἑροίεις*. II, *ως* in l. 620 is not to be read with *τόδι* but is to be translated 'because' and goes with what follows. III, l. 1321, for *μαστεύοντα <πόνον>* try *μαστεύοντα ἀπνοός*. IV, ll.

1353-4, try ὅν οὐ θέμις <σφ'> οὐδὲ ὁσία παρῶσας ἐν <μὲν> θαλάμοις; ll. 1366-7, try οὐδέ τιν ἦν λαθεῖν | ὑπερβασίαν ἢ. *Bacchantes*, l. 1003, change to -στός γ' ἀθέων ἔφυ; l. 983, change to ὡς κλοπὸς ὅφεται.

Ad *Bucol.* I, 70 (163-164). R. Cahen does not agree with L. Havet (see above, p. 101), and emends l. 70 to *Post ah quot mea regna*, etc.

Virgile, *Bucoliques* 3, 100 (164-168). L. Havet continues his examination of this line.

Diodore, ἀπὸ φωνῆς 'ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙ'ΟΥ (169-173). L. Mariès brings forward good reasons for attributing to Diodorus of Tarsus the body of the commentary contained in the *Coislin. gr. 275*. The compilation of the marginal portion of the commentary was the work of Anastasius.

L'âne et la vigne (Hygin., *Fab.* 274, 1) (174-181). G. Lafaye examines into the original sources of the fable.

Survivances des luttes politiques du V^e siècle chez les orateurs Attiques du IV^e siècle (182-205). G. Mathieu examines the types which the orators used. Solon=δ *νομοθέτης*, Aristides=δ *δικαιώτατος ἀνήρ*, Kritias=type de la tyrannie extrême. Parallel passages from Andocides and Aeschines are given, and M. thinks both draw from the same source. The orators' points of view are attributable in part also to social status.

Notes sur la vita Cypriani et sur Lucianus (206-210). L. Bayard amends *Vita Cypriani* 4, 1: *Erat sane illi etiam de nobis* to *novis*; also the reply of Lucianus to Celerinus: *quibus scio—vicisti* is emended to *quibus eum . . . versato risi gaudio* *vicisti*, and *novi* is not to be read as perfect of *nosco*, but as gen. of *novus*.

La déesse Julie: CIG. 2815 et 3642 (211-214). W. H. Buckler in *Rev. de Phil.* XXXVII, 1913, p. 331, did not know of a case where Julia Domna had the epithet *θεά* in inscriptions. He gives a case, supplied by G. F. Hill, on a coin of Trapezopolis in Caria. CIG 2815 and 3642, supposed to refer to Julia Domna, B. believes to refer to Livia.

La notation ascendante des nombres dans la chronique d'Eusèbe (215-218). D. Serruys calls attention to the care which must be taken to determine whether any given chronological writer has used the descending or ascending system of notation.

Bulletin bibliographique (219-239). Th. Fitzhugh, Indo-european rhythm (J. Marouzeau). F. Lübkers *Reallexikon des klass. Altertums*, 8th ed. (P. Lejay). L. Laurand, *Manuel des Études grecques et latines*, Fasc. I. (R. Duchamp de

Lageneste). É. Bourguet, *Les ruines de Delphes* (B. Haussoullier). L. Hivet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (P. Lejay). D. Barbelenet, *De l'aspect verbal en latin ancien et particulièrement dans Térence* (J. Marouzeau). Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (P. Lejay). O. Kramer, ed., C. Valeri Flacci *Argonauticon libri VIII* (J. Marouzeau). Fr. Norden, *Apulejus von Madaura und das römische Privatrecht*. P. Lehmann, *Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften* (P. Lejay).

Platonica (241-244), A. Diès offers these changes in text: I. Rep. 364e/365a, *βίβλων*—*περιμένει*, for δὰ *θυσῶν* καὶ *παθῶν* *ηδονῶν* read δὰ *θυσῶν* καὶ δὰ *σπουδῶν*; II. Legg. 960c/d, *ἄ Κλεινία*—*δύναμιν*, after *τὴν Ἀτροπον* δὴ *τρίτην* read <*τὴν*> *σωτηρίαν*, and for *τῷ πυρὶ* read *τῷ τρὶ* <*τῷ*>.

Notes critiques aux chapitres de Pline relatifs à l'histoire de l'art (245-254). A. J. Reinach discusses the group paintings of Parrhasios as given by Pliny. N. H. XXXV, 71 *Aeneas*, Castorque ac Pollux, he changes to *Helena* C. ac P.; XXXV, 70 for et *Philiscum* et *Liberum* he suggests et *Phrynicum* etc.

Une étymologie ancienne du nom de Sarapis (255-258). P. Roussel discusses the interpretation of Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, chap. XXIX.

Les lettres de Diogène à Monime et la confrontation des *ΤΟΠΟΙ* (259-271). R. Nihard discusses letters XXXVII and XXXIX, and concludes that they are lettres de direction, and develop the same idea, that of *ἄσκησις*.

Correspondance de Saint Cyprien, corrections à faire au texte de Hartel (272-273). L. Bayard emends: Ep. I, 1, p. 645, 14; IV, 2, p. 474, 9 et s.; VIII, 1, p. 485, 19 et s.; XI, 5, p. 499, 11; XIII, 4, p. 506, 25-507, 1 et s.

Le texte du Phèdre et le Vindobonensis 54 (W) (274-284). H. Alline gives results of his collation of ms. W, using Burnet's 2d edition (Oxford Texts). His collation shows that Vind. 109 (Φ) and Ambr. 56 (r) derive from W, and that Ven. 189 (S of Schanz) and Vind. 80 (Vind. 3 of Stallbaum) belong to same group.

Sophocle, Trachiniennes, v. 554 (285-286); H. Grégoire changes *λύπημα* to *λοίσθημα*, on grounds of confusion of Byzantine pronunciation of *υ* with *οι*: *λύπημα* a lapsus for *λοίσθημα*, a gloss of *λοίσθημα*.

Un graffite mal compris (287-289). S. Reinach thinks that the inscription found on one of the bronze doors of the Capitol during Stilicho's pillage, given by Zosimus (V, 35) as MISERO

REGI SERVANTUR, and which Hodgkin took at face value, should be NIGER Q. REGII SERVVS.

Un manuscrit palimpseste du commentaire de Proclus au Timée de Platon (290-291). D. Serruys calls attention to the difficulty raised by the establishment of the fact that A of Plato and the oldest ms. of Proclus are copies made by the same hand in the same shop.

Bulletin bibliographique (292-301). E. Samter, Die Religion der Griechen; Entaphia, in memoria di Emilio Pozzi: (1) G. de Sanctis, Les Nomophylakes d'Athènes, (2) L. Paret, Deux recherches de chronologie grecque, (3) A. Ferrabino, Θεσσαλῶν πολιτεῖα, (4) A. Rostagni, Isocrate et Philippe, (5) L. Cocco, Le décret apostolique de Jérusalem, (6) G. A. Alfero, Les dernières années de Naevius, (7) B. Motzo, Examen historico-critique du 3^e livre de Macchabées (G. Mathieu); Papyri Iandanae ed. C. Kalbfleisch, Instrumenta graeca publica et privata, ed. L. Spohr (B. Haussoullier); Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino, 2d ed., G. Landgraf; Q. Horati Flacci carmina, Rec. Fr. Vollmer; M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri X, tert. ed. C. Hosius; Corpus agrimensorum Romanorum, Rec. C. Thulin; Iulii Firmici Materni Matheseos libri VIII, ed. W. Kroll et F. Skutsch; A. Dieterich, Nekyia (Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse), 2d ed. (P. Lejay); Jas. Mearns, Early Latin Hymnaries (Abbé Hocedez); Jas. Mearns, The Canticles of the Christian Church Eastern and Western in Early and Mediaeval Times (H. Lebègue).

Les architectes et entrepreneurs à Délos de 314 à 240 (303-330). Lacroix examines the results of Homolle and Glotz on the functions, magisterial qualifications and earnings of the architects, and the partnerships, pay and position of the contractors. A list of both architects and contractors is given on pages 326-330.

Bulletin bibliographique (332-334). J. Bielcki, De aetatis Demosthenicae studiis Libanianis (G. Mathieu); P. de Labriolle, La crise montaniste, and idem, Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme (P. Lejay).

Revue des comptes rendus (parus en 1913) d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique (1-123).

Revue des revues et publications (1913) d'Académies (1-245).

R. V. D. MAGOFFIN.

REPORT OF RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, Vol. LXX, 4.

Pp. 482-523. Kurt Witte, Worthrythmus bei Homer. Under the foregoing title the author proposes to publish, in place of a complete history of the language of the Greek epos, a series of articles on the various problems of the Homeric language. The present article, which is worthy of the careful consideration of scholars that are interested in the subject of Homeric meter and language, bears the subtitle 'Στίχοι ἀκέφαλοι und στίχοι μείουροι'. The author shows successively that position before the bucolic caesura, position between the bucolic caesura and the end of the verse, position before the feminine caesura, the fifth foot, the second foot, the sixth foot, the third trochee, and ictus in general were productive of new forms that took their place beside the regular forms. An adequate list of representative examples of each of these categories would exceed the limits of the space available for this report. As a striking illustration, however, of the influence of position in the creation of metrically lengthened forms may be mentioned the behavior of such words as *ἀνήρ*, *ὑδωρ*, and *Ἄρης*. The nominative *ἀνήρ* with short *α* is found about 140 times in the interior of the verse, whereas 45 of the 50 examples of *ἀνήρ* with long *α* are found in the sixth foot. *ὑδωρ* is used as an iambus 25 times, but 46 of the 48 examples of its use as a spondee are found in the sixth foot. *Ἄρης* has iambic measurement in 31 instances, whilst 17 of the 19 instances of spondaic measurement are found in the sixth foot. The material examined leads the author to enunciate the principle that in Homeric verse metrical lengthening is determined not solely by metrical necessity but also by metrical convenience. By the application of this principle he does away with all the so-called *ἀκέφαλοι* and *μείουροι στίχοι*.

Pp. 524-550. Th. Birt, Der Aufbau der sechsten und vierten Satire Juvenals. The author thinks that he has succeeded in making a satisfactory analysis of the sixth satire of Juvenal. He points out that the poem is not a satire on women in general, but that it is directed against married women alone. The main body of the poem is divided into two parts, the one treating of the relation of the married woman to her husband, the other of her relations to other persons. There is also an introduction and a brief conclusion. The recurrence of similar thoughts in the four divisions is natural. The same thought serves different purposes in different divisions. Similar repetitions are found in Cicero, who is a master of analysis. The outline of the poem is as follows. Part I. Chastity has departed from Rome (1-135): Chastity dwelt at Rome in the age of Saturn (1-20). Adultery crept in as early as the Silver age (21-37). Ursidius wants a wife and is looking for a chaste woman (38-47). A

chaste matron may perhaps be found in some solitary country place (48-59), but not at Rome (61-81). A warning example is Eppia, the senator's wife, who ran off to Egypt with a gladiator (82-113). Things are no better at court (114-132), to say nothing of the poison administered to Britannicus (133-135). Part II. Relation of wife to husband (136-345): (a) Annoyances of the married man's life (136-285): From the wife that is rich (136-141), beautiful (142-161), impeccable (161-183); that knows Greek (184-199); that tyrannizes over the husband that dotes upon her (200-225); that is looking for a divorce (224-230); the mother-in-law (231-241); the litigious propensities of the wife (242-245); her fondness for practice with gladiatorial weapons (246-267); the adulterous wife (268-285). (b) The cause of this abnormal condition (286-345): The luxurious mode of living that has come from abroad (286-300); the excesses that characterize the private (300-334) and public religious cults of the women (335-345). Part III. Relations of the wife to others than her husband (346-591): She cannot be locked in (346-348); attends the public shows (349-365); is fond of eunuchs (366-378), devoted to musicians (379-397), interested in the city news (398-412), brutal to her poor neighbors (413-418); neglectful of her guests (419-433), fond of displaying her knowledge of literature, rhetoric, and grammar (434-456); adorns herself to attract the moechi (457-473); her behavior at toilet (474-506); her intimacy with oriental priests and soothsayers (511-591). Part IV. Criminal conduct of the wife (592-661): She practices abortion (592-609); makes her husband insane by administering love-potions (610-626); and even poisons him and his children (626-661). The Winstedt fragment is rejected as spurious.

The author thinks that the fourth satire is a unit and not a piece of patchwork. Verses 1-36 are a mimus-like conversation and serve as a prologue. The connection of thought between the prologue and the body of the poem is this: 'Mad was the luxury of Crispinus in the matter of fish; still madder the luxury of his imperial master Domitian.' The body of the fourth satire is a parodic rhapsody on Domitian and his court.

Pp. 551-567. Hermann Mutschmann, *Eine peripatetische Quelle Lukians*. The source of Lucian's *περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥᾳδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῆ* was a Peripatetic treatise on character, the title and the precise literary form of which cannot be determined, but the author of which was most probably Ariston of Keos. The work in question may have been a special tract, perhaps a letter like the *ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας*, or it may have been some larger ethical treatise. If it was a special tract, the treatment must have harmonized with the author's ethical views as elsewhere expressed; and the essay, or letter,

must have been regarded by its writer as a contribution to the larger subject of friendship.

Pp. 568-583. K. Busche, *Kritische Beitraege zu Senecas Naturales Quaestiones*. The following passages receive consideration: I Praef. 3 (in connection with which the author discusses the use of asyndeton in Seneca); 5, 12; 16, 7; 17, 9; II 12, 5; 29 E; 32, 8; 35, 1; 40, 4; 59, 6; III 15, 5; 18, 3; 19, 2; 26, 7; 27, 9; 28, 5; 29, 3; 6; 9; IV a, 2, 5; 10; 12; b, 13, 2; V 9, 3; 12, 5; 13, 2; 18, 7; VI 10, 1; 22, 4; 32, 2; VII 24, 2.

Pp. 584-590. Wilhelm Bannier, *Zu den attischen Uebergabeurkunden des 4. Jahrhunderts in Kolumnenschrift*. As a result of the restudy of the inscriptions specified in the title, Bannier gives an improved arrangement of the lines of Johnson's fragment (A. J. A. XVIII 1 ff.), and he shows that II 747, or its like, probably constituted the first column of an inscription of which the Johnson-Woodward fragment constituted the second and third columns, II 676, or its like, the lower part of the fourth column, and II 693, or its like, the fifth column. The author also makes interesting observations on the contents, the method of arrangement, and the relative dates of other treasury lists of this period.

Pp. 591-610. W. Kroll, *Randbemerkungen*. (Continued from Rh. Mus. LXIX 95.) XXVIII. Emendations of Julius Valerius. XXIX. The Varro referred to in the phrase 'Varro in Ephemeride' in the *Brevis Expositio ad Verg. Georg. I 397*, may very well have been the grammarian Marcus Terentius Varro, who was the author of two *ephemerides*. It is commonly believed that the person designated by Donatus was the poet P. Varro Atacinus, who translated Aratus. Granting that the fragment of the *Expositio* may have belonged to P. Varro's translation of Aratus, the translation itself could not have borne the title of *Ephemeris*, for such an application of the term *ephemeris* is not found before Fulgentius, *Virg. cont. 34. 9. XXX*. Critical note on the fragment of the *Harpazomene* of Caecilius cited by Donatus on Terent. *Eunuch. 671. XXXI*. The eleventh speech of Dio is a specimen of what the rhetoricians called *ἀνασκευή*. Dio did not draw upon Aristotle for the details of his Homeric criticism, as Montgomery, *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, p. 405 ff., thought, but upon a compilation belonging to a later age and embracing the results of Aristotelian and Alexandrian criticism.

Pp. 611-621. Alfred Klotz, *Zur Kritik einiger ciceronischer Reden. IV. Pro Rabirio Postumo*. The author discusses and emends passages of sections 31, 42, 43, 26, 47.

Pp. 622-637. A. Brinkmann, *Die olympische Chronik*. The author reviews and combats the various arguments that have

been advanced against the authenticity of the list of Olympian victors, and marshals and supplements the arguments that have been adduced in its support. A special contribution to the subject is a study of the names of the victors mentioned in the list. The article concludes with the statement that the list has not only successfully withstood all attacks that have been directed against it, but has been continually receiving new confirmation from every possible quarter.

Pp. 638-644. Miszellen. A. Schober, Ein Homerzitat bei Philodem *περὶ ἔσεβειας* (638-639). Fragments 242 II a and 247 II are consecutive and the gaps must be restored thus:

242 II a	ἐπιδεικ] νυσθαι	τέα δὲ μάντ]ιν "Ομη-
	λέγοντιν ἔ] νιος κατά	ρος ὁδε συγγρ]άφει.
Δίαν (?) Γλαῦ] κον, 'Αριστο-		247 II
τέλης δ' αἱ] τὸν πλεῦ-		"γέρων ἀλι[ος νημερ-
σαι εἰς Δῆλο] ν καὶ τὰς		τίς, ἀθάν[ατος Πρω-
Νηρηίδας.] τὸν Πρω-		τεύς".

Guenther Jachmann, Der Name Hellespont (640-644). The author takes a middle course between Sieglin, who claimed that in the early Greek authors, more particularly in Hecataeus, the term Hellespont included also the Aegean, and Klotz, who maintained that this use of the term originated in the brain of some grammarian and had no literary warrant. Birt had already cited Ciris 413 as an instance of the wider use, and Jachmann now adduces the following additional examples, Culex 337, Herc. O. 775, Sen. Agam. 565, Trag. inc. LV p. 289 R.³ The source of the wider use seems to J. to have been some Hellenistic poet.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BRIEF MENTION.

In view of the space given up to Paulus Silentarius and the Greek Anthology in the present number, I cannot do more than announce the appearance of a new volume of the *Loeb Classical Library* in which we are presented with a translation of the *Fifth and Sixth Books of the Greek Anthology* by the well-known scholar W. R. PATON. Not only so but 'donatus iam rude' as I am, I ought to lay aside the ferule which I used for sixty years on the performances of my pupils, and forswear any further criticisms of translations. But I have grateful memories of Mr. PATON's other work and especially of his striking illustration of the famous dictum of Goethe that a knowledge of the poet's country is essential to the understanding of the poet himself. Pindar's *ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλβακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί* (I. 2, 8) lay hid in night until Mr. PATON published a paper in the Classical Review (June 1888, p. 180) from which it appeared that the personified songs, like Eastern dancers, 'plastered their faces with silver coins'. This paper was followed by J. G. Frazer in the C. R. for Oct. of the same year, p. 261; and in A. J. P. XXX 358 I gave yet another illustration from Hichens's Garden of Allah. Of this evident explanation, Sir John Sandys has nothing better to say than 'Probably'. Eastern dancers, after all, he might urge, are not Greek dancers and Goethe's dictum does not apply with full force. But Southern Italy is Magna Graecia and it is interesting to read in Briggs's 'In the Heart of Italy' that in Lecce 'every guest that danced with the bride gave her a handkerchief or a piece of silver. In the latter case she spat on it and stuck it on her forehead.' Now Lecce is not far from Calimera and Thumb has given us a specimen of the Greek of Calimera, recorded by Morosi and Comparetti. The origin of the custom may be Eastern, the tradition is certainly Greek. An interpretation based on actual vision carries or ought to carry conviction, and I am sorry that Sir John Sandys is not quite convinced. Another interpretation of the same sort that I advocated for P. 2, 82: *ἀγὰν πάγχυ διαπλέκει* (A. J. P. XXVIII 109, XXX 358) has been followed by Sir John, in spite of the *πλατὺς γέλως* of Walter Headlam (l. c.), and he renders the words 'weaveth on every side a tangled path'. 'Weaving a path' would probably not have commended itself to Headlam the fastidious any more than 'weaving a bend', but I was interested to read in a local newspaper the vivid description of a cheap lodging-house,

in which occur the words 'weaving one's way among the stair contortionists'. Scholars must live the life of the day, if they are to make their other life truly alive.

In spite of the protest just expressed against the overdoing of the Greek Anthology in this number, Paulus Silentarius intrudes into the confines of *Brief Mention*. After my article was out of my hands, I was made aware of a paper in *Classical Philology* for June 1916 (p. 336) in which Professor FISKE comments on a much discussed passage of my old enemy Persius V 165-66: *dum Chrysidis udas | ebrius ante fores exstincta cum face canto*. The scene is taken from the New Comedy, maintains Professor FISKE, which nobody will deny. The key to 'udas', which is variously interpreted, is given, according to Professor FISKE, by two passages. In one, Lucilius XXIX 841, something is thrown down from the window on the approaching *<lovers>* and the something is hot water according to Marx's interpretation of 846. More convincing is the familiar passage from Horace, Sat. 2, 7, 90-91: *foribusque repulsum | perfundit gelida*. Now the same situation occurs in Paulus A. P. V 281—by no means one of his worst:

χθιζά μοι 'Ερμώνασσα φιλακρήτους μετὰ κώμους
στέμμαστν αὐλείας ἀμφιπλέκοντι θύρας
ἐκ κυλίκων ἐπέχενεν ὑδωρ· ἀμάθυνε δὲ χαίτην,
ἢν μόλις ἐς τρισσὴν πλέξαμεν ἀμφιλύκρν.
ἐφλέχθην δ' ἐπι μᾶλλον ὑφ' ὕδατος· ἐκ γάρ ἐκείνης
λάθριον είχε κύλιξ πῦρ γλυκερῶν στομάτων.

In his commentary Veniero cites the Horatian passage and quotes Mallet's *Quaestiones Propertianaæ*, p. 44: *Amans aqua perfusus ab irata puella maiorem se accepisse amoris ardorem ait, quod ex comoedia quadam sumptum esse putat Benndorfius Griech. Vasenbilder 1877, p. 91 collata vasis pictura tab. 44.* In my commentary, I have *not* cited Propertius 1, 16, 4, which is not to the point.

In the *Revue archéologique* of last year M. SALOMON REINACH published an interesting sketch of his master *Michel Bréal* (1832-1915)—a vivid personality whose memory abides with me as fresh as it was the day after my solitary interview with him in 1880. From this notice we learn that philological studies came near losing two of their most distinguished French representatives, Bréal, because he was a Jew, and Perrot, because he was a Protestant. In A. J. P. XXIV 353-358 and XXVIII 208-217, I gave a sympathetic account of Bréal's views on the

Homeric Question as contained in *Un problème de l'histoire littéraire*. Carried away as I am too often by the company I happen to be keeping when I am reading Homer, to one thing I have been fairly constant. Homer's world was no rudimentary world. No simplicity of a rude age was his. No ballad-singer was he. Horace may have overdone the matter when he complimented Homer on his ethics, but that Homer was a subtle psychologist I have always been ready to maintain (A. J. P. XXXI 358). Helen was a true woman, even if there is an aura of divinity about her, and I take no umbrage at the flirtations of Penelope. And so far forth I am with Bréal.

For a fairly faithful summary of Bréal's views I must refer to the articles already cited. The German reviews of the book, so far as I have recorded them were hostile or, what is worse, sniffy. Bréal, it is true, laid himself open to criticism by reason of sundry slips, which all scholars might not be disposed to treat so leniently as Seymour has done, who wrote in his generous way Cl. Phil. III 106 (quoted A. J. P. XXIX 125): 'About a dozen clear cases of oscitancy might be noted but no one would urge them against M. Bréal's scholarship.' I myself have cited (A. J. P. XXVIII 210) his droll mistake in making Thetis the daughter of Zeus, and an esteemed correspondent has nearly made up the tale of 'the dozen clear cases of oscitancy' to which Seymour refers. It was Theano and not Andromache (p. 8) that spread the peplos on the knees of Athena (Z 302). Arete and the consort of Alkinoos were one and the same and not different persons (p. 27). Helen was not queen of Pylos any more than Sirmium was in Dacia (Essays and Studies p. 384). Andromache makes three appearances and not two merely. X 437 is too memorable to be overlooked. There was no fight between Aphrodite and Diomedes (p. 68). Aphrodite, as my correspondent puts it, was a Red Cross nurse, Diomedes, a champion of frightfulness. Homer does not tell us that Iphigeneia was sacrificed (p. 82). The only offering up of Iphigeneia mentioned is where Iphigeneia under the name of Iphianassa is offered in marriage to Achilles—a point which I overlooked in my summary (XXVIII 213), though my summaries are things for which I take no responsibility except that of fidelity to the work summarized. Still such mistakes do not affect the main contention and this it is that stirred the ire and derision of the German critics. Schroeder sneered at Bréal's thesis (D. L. Z. 6. Juni 1908) and Kluge in the now deceased N. P. R. 1907 declared: Dass durch diese Anschauung die ganze homerische Frage auf den Kopf gestellt wird, sieht jeder, der die Ilias genauer kennt und die Sache unbefangen betrachtet.

In view of this outgiving the following anecdote for which M. Reinach vouches has its amusing side.

Pendant qu'il imprimait son œuvre Bréal reçut la visite d'un célèbre savant allemand et lui exposa sa thèse. 'Mais, c'est ce que nous enseignons', dit le philologue. 'Alors', repartit Bréal, 'c'est dans votre enseignement ésotérique, car ceux de vos livres que j'ai lus disent tout autre chose.'

It was, I must confess, somewhat of a shock to me to find that Bréal considered Paley (A. J. P. XXVIII 213) to have good sense 'comme en général les Anglais quand ils suivent leur propre instinct'—but it is not uninstructive to compare with Bréal's thesis the latest views of two English scholars, one of them the foremost Homerist among English-speaking peoples.

CHADWICK in the *Heroic Age* says:

It is not sensible to regard the Anglo-Saxon poems, still less the Homeric poems, as products of barbarism. The courts which gave birth to such poetry must have appreciated to a considerable extent the culture as well as the luxury of earlier civilization.

And LEAF, *Homer and History*:

Greek history arose in courts, in the society of a small and refined aristocracy, the lower elements were introduced at a later stage and appealed to a mixed audience.

In the great war between the 'Einheitshirten' and the 'Kleinliederjäger' the middle ground has become narrower and narrower ever since I can remember. There are other things I should like to copy from this interesting sketch. Of Latin grammar Bréal said 'La grammaire latine est devenue chez nous un terrain mouvant dans lequel rien ne tient debout' and he protests against the use of meaningless examples in school-grammars, just as I protested in my Latin School Grammar of 1898. But 1898 is 1898, Bréal and I were close contemporaries, both out of date.

Sunt quos—There are those who delight in collecting 'howlers' such as the malevolent might call the slips made by Bréal that have been specified above. Of school-boy, of undergraduate, mistakes there is simply no end. The late Professor Norton had a choice collection, with which he was wont to regale his guests. I remember a very amusing anthology published years ago in Macmillan's Magazine. The report of the Quincy School held its own as a classic for many years. Fully aware of my own shortcomings, I have never gloated over such things. When I asked my boys to translate 'The horsemen were cap-

tured arms and all', I hardly smiled when the rendering was handed in: *οἱ ἴπποι αὐτῶν ὅπλαις ἔλωσαν*. Those who are curious in such things will find not a few specimens recorded in the thirty-six volumes of the JOURNAL. But 'Noli altum sapere sed time', the old Robert Stephens motto (A. J. P. XXXV 461), has been before me these sixty odd years, ever since I wrote one of my youthful papers on Henry Stephens, as he was called then. If I mention such things, it is to teach a lesson we all need. My attention has been called to a false genealogy in my Pindar O. 7, 23 which makes Tlepolemos the husband and not the son of Astydamia. The error is due to a wrong alignment as the commentary shews, but alas! the mistake has been copied. Another Pindarist, the same informant writes, has made Peleus marry Harmonia, and an eminent scholar tells on Herodotus the story that Herodotus tells on Hekataios—and there are those who will say that it serves Herodotus right, that thief of the world (A. J. P. X 253). —

In the Introduction to his edition of the *Medea*, that playful sprite Verrall amused himself with illustrating the processes of textual criticism by imaginary corruptions in the text of Milton. Anyone who has been a slave of the press as long as I have been would find it unnecessary to resort to imaginary corruptions. It is only needful to reveal the secrets of the prison-house from which corrected proofs are released. To take two instances of recent occurrence, if it had not been for the vigilance of the proof-reader 'the undeniable charm of the best exemplars of English scholarship' would have appeared as 'the undesirable charm' (XXXVII 495, l. 6) and 'Nothing is more contagious than the sneering habit' (l. c., p. 496, l. 24) would have been turned into a hygienic warning against the 'sneezing habit'. Corruptions of this kind maintain themselves for generations in our English classics.¹ And one such corruption has given rise to an international correspondence, the upshot of which may be interesting to the students of Poe. At the same time, I am not quite prepared to follow the example of the *Revue critique*, which has recently begun a series of questions and answers, though to judge by sundry utterances, such a sub-section of the JOURNAL would be welcome to some of the readers

¹ A few years ago when my criticisms of Browning's improprieties called forth anonymous remonstrance and private corrections (A. J. P. XXXII 241; XXXVI 237), one of my correspondents wrote to me touching the *Pippa Passes* pedantry. 'Some men are incredibly innocent . . . The most astounding instance I have seen is that of the editor of Little, Brown and Co.'s edition of Gray's Poems, who turned the line in the 'Jemmy Twitcher' poem

But his *name* is a shame and his eyes are so lewd
into
But his *nose* is a shame, etc.'

of *Brief Mention*; for with all my honest endeavour to convey a perfectly clear surface meaning (A. J. P. XXXII 483) I am not seldom accused of Heraklitean tenebricosity. $\phi\acute{e}yyos \mu\acute{e}n \xi\acute{e}vvero\acute{e}i, \acute{a}\xi\acute{e}vvero\acute{e}i \delta' \acute{e}pe\acute{e}bos.$

But to the present problem—propounded by a scholar, whose position demands respectful consideration.

'The <puzzling passage>', my correspondent writes 'occurs in a letter of Poe's to Mr. —— dated 1831, and dealing with Poetry in general and more particularly with the theories of Coleridge and Wordsworth. It runs thus:

Yet, let not Mr. W. despair, he has given immortality to a wagon and the bee. Sophocles has eternalized a sore toe and dignified a tragedy with a chorus of turkeys.

I have consulted four or five copies including two of the most recent editions of Poe's works and find no variant except that a recent English edition prints 'waggon'.

Now it is perfectly evident that 'turkeys' is an impossible reading. Quite apart from the fact that the *Mel-eagris Gallopavo* was as unknown to the age of Sophocles as broom-corn to the days of Thomas Creede (A. J. P. XXXI 239) there is no trace of a bird-chorus in Sophocles, and we must fall back upon conjectural emendation. Poe's beautiful handwriting might give us pause. Still with printers all things are possible and palaeographically 'jockeys' would not be difficult. To my mind the case is as simple of solution as the one to which I can bear personal witness, in which Jacob's 'limping leg' was transmuted in print into Jacob's 'limping 69'. 'Jackies' for the mariners of the chorus of the *Ajax* would be in keeping with the tone of the 'sore toe' of the *Philoctetes*. But 'jockey' or 'jackie' for 'jacktar' has no literary warrant except in recent American periodical literature. Poe was practically a Southerner. Southern literary men of his type were conservatives, and the 'animus suspicax' of your true critic must suspend judgment until he finds out whether the word 'jockey' was used at West Point, where Poe was a cadet for a time, in mockery of the other branch of the service. Doubtless my conjecture has been anticipated but that furnishes only another analogy to the processes of that conjectural criticism which takes up so much space in the annals of classical scholarship.¹

¹ Since the above *Brief Mention* was in print a letter has been received from my correspondent with further details, which I subjoin:

"I quote this from the 'Works', ed. Stedman & Woodberry, London, 1895. The letter was reprinted in the 'Southern Literary Messenger', July, 1836, with revisions. This revised version is printed in an ed. of the 'Works' published by Shiells in London and Lippincott in Philadelphia, 1895, vol. 5, pp. 92-100. The above passage appears on p. 98 with the variants 'waggon' for 'wagon', and 'transmitted to eternity' for 'eternalized'."

W. P. Mustard: ETTORE STAMPINI. *Studi di letteratura e filologia latina*. Torino: Fratelli Bocca, 1917. Pp. 447. Lire 6. This first volume of Professor STAMPINI's "collected works" includes a number of studies which have been published in various books and journals in the last thirty-six years. The earliest is a lecture delivered in 1880, a plea for a closer study of Roman metre. The latest (1915) deals with the name of the painter Marcus Plautius (Plin. N. H. xxxv. 115). This maintains that the word *loco* of the inscription has nothing to do with the artist's name. It is an ablative depending upon *digna*; and the first line should read, *Dignis digna loco. Picturis condecoravit*—'Ai degni onore degno del luogo', etc. The longest and most interesting article is a discussion of the legend of Aeneas and Dido in Roman literature (1892). Another long article, which is more familiar to American readers, deals with the tradition of the suicide of Lucretius (1896). There are two chapters of *Lucretiana* (1902 and 1915), a note on the spelling of the name 'Vergilius' (1883), and two studies of the *Bucolics* (1904). One of these treats of the chronology of the *Elegies*, and maintains that we have them all in the order of their composition, except that the first is later than the second and third. In an appendix Professor STAMPINI gives some of his own inscriptions and other formal compositions in Latin. The subjects range from a medal offered for a university rifle match—"in signo armis ignivomis feriendo"—to the prowess of the Italian fleet (June, 1916)—"hostilium navium sub mari navigantium insidias et spes irritas facit, et submersa vel aquis innatantia machinamenta offensu dissilientia vitans", etc.

W. P. M.: *The Influence of Horace upon the chief English Poets of the Nineteenth Century*. By MARY REBECCA THAYER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916. Pp. 117. The English poets studied in this dissertation are Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, and Browning. Of these, the most Horatian in spirit is Wordsworth; the most Horatian in style and workmanship is Tennyson. Byron and Browning quote Horace frequently; but their quotations are usually mere 'external embellishments', consciously and deliberately used. Byron was always more interested in the *Satires* and *Epistles* than in the *Odes*; Shelley was interested only in the lyric poems. The influence of Horace on the poetry of Coleridge is 'almost negligible'; as for Keats, he shows no Horatian element at all. The quotation from Browning (p. 104), "fluff, nutshell, and naught,—thank Flaccus for the phrase", can hardly refer to Horace (*Sat. ii. 5, 36*);

possibly, it refers to something in Persius. It would be quite like the pedantic Browning to refer to Persius as 'Flaccus'; and he may even have offered his vile phrase as a translation of *spumosum et cortice pingui*, i. 96, or of *bullatis . . . nugis*, v. 19. Another quotation from Browning (p. 109), "no more friskings o'er the fruitful (*foodful?*) glebe", should perhaps be compared with Horace's description of 'Lyde', Od. iii. 11, 9, "quae velut latis equa trima campis | ludit exsultim", etc.

W. P. M.: *The Cambridge Songs, a Goliard Song Book of the XIth Century*; edited from the unique manuscript in the Cambridge University Library, by Karl Breul. Cambridge, The University Press: New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915. Pp. X + 120. \$6.50. This is a sumptuous edition of a remarkable collection of Medieval Latin poems, which probably was the song book or commonplace book of some early goliard (*clericus vagabundus*). The editor provides an excellent photographic reproduction of all the ten folios, with a transliteration; then he repeats the poems in an improved and more serviceable text. He reviews the work hitherto done on these songs (1720-1914) and adds some notes and criticism of his own. "The very valuable notes contained in the third edition (by E. Steinmeyer, 1892) of Müllenhoff and Scherer's *Denkmäler* have purposely not been reproduced here. This scholarly work is still indispensable, and as it is easily accessible students should make a point of consulting it; but attention is called in the notes to all later publications in which the commentary of the *Denkmäler* is either supplemented or corrected." The closing chapter discusses a contested passage in the macaronic poem *De Heinrico*. The book will be welcomed by all students of Medieval literature.

W. P. M.: *Le Satire di Orazio*, commentate da VINCENZO USSANI. Napoli: Fr. Perrella, 1916. Pp. 209. Lire 2. In this edition the Satires are studied with special reference to the philosophical movement of Horace's day. For example, the first is regarded as a parody of a διαρπίζη of Crispinus. The editor allows himself several changes in the text: *cum*, for *si*, i. 6, 24; *exsudes*, for *exsudet*, i. 10, 28; *tum*, for *cum*, ii. 2, 43; *furorem*, for *cruorem*, ii. 3, 275. And some of his explanatory notes are unusual, or new. *Urna*, i. 5, 91, is taken as a nominative, 'la fonte'; *curto*, i. 6, 104, means 'castrato'; *quine*, i. 10, 21, is an interrogative adverb; *bilinguis*, i. 10, 30, is a nominative; *qui*, i. 10, 108, means 'how?'—a question of the puzzled Maecenas. In ii. 5, 90-91, *ultra 'non' 'etiam' sileas* means

'don't say more than *yes* and *no*'. In i. 10, 28-29, the proper names are *Pedius*=‘Quintus Pedius, console del 711/43 e celebre oratore’, and *Poplicola Corvinus*=‘M. Valerius Poplicola Messala Corvinus, l'amico di Tibullo.’

W. P. M.: *Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers*. By WILLIAM JACOB KELLER. Madison, Wis., 1916. Pp. 191. 40 cents. This is a careful and methodical collection of all of Goethe's more important utterances on the subject of classical literature. The Greek and Roman authors are taken up in chronological order; the book has a useful index, and a table which shows what ancient writers Goethe was especially interested in at various periods of his life. In the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XV 512-542, Dr. KELLER has published a second study of the same material, in which he investigates the qualities of Greek and Latin literature by which Goethe was especially attracted. The most important of these are: “moderation, simplicity, unity, artistic finish, clearness, and, above all, realism”.

W. P. M.: G. WESSELS. *Libri Tres De Calamitatibus Temporum B. Baptistae Mantuani*. Rome, 1916. Pp. 96. This little book, issued in commemoration of the fourth centenary of “good old Mantuan’s” death, is a welcome addition to our list of humanistic texts. It gives one of the most interesting of his longer poems—a poem written in an evil time. Italy is suffering from war, and famine, and pestilence—all sent from Heaven because of the wickedness of man and the neglect of religion. The world needs a second Elias—like the prophet who founded the Carmelite Order—needs more of the faith of Noah or of Abraham. The editor contributes an introduction on the life and works of the author; one wishes he had added a few notes on the poem itself. He rejects the statement of Paulus Jovius that Mantuan was “ex damnato coitu natus”, and tries to refute it out of the poet's own writings. But the passage he relies upon is rather vague and inconclusive. Perhaps the most interesting inference to be drawn from it is that Mantuan's mother, Constantia Maia (Costanza de' Maggi) bore the same family name as the mother of Virgil.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Blair (R.) *Archaeologia Aeliana*; or Misc. tracts rel. to antiquity, Ser. 3, vol. 13. Newcastle, *Soc. Actuaries* 1916. Illustr., 382 pp., 15s. (to members).

Boyajian. *Armenian Legends and Poems*. Introd. by Rt. Hon. Visct. Bryce. London, *Dent*, 1916. Illustr., royal folio, 212 pp., 21s. net.

Boyd (Ernest A.) *Ireland's Literary Renaissance*. London, *Maunsel*, 1916. Royal 8°, 415 pp., 7s. 6d. net.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). *Selected papers of Cicero*, ed. H. McNeill Poteat. Boston, *Heath*, 1916. 12 + 201 pp. \$1.

Cicero, *On Old Age (De Senectute)*. Tr. into English, with introd. and notes by Sir Robt. Allison. London, *Humphreys*, 1916. 1s. 6d. net.

Cooper (Lane). *A Concordance to the Works of Horace*. Washington, D. C., *Carn. Inst.* 9 + 593 pp. Paper \$7.

Dio Cassius. *Dio's Roman History*. Engl. tr. by Ernest Cary (in 9 vols.). Vol. 4. London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 502 pp., 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Droop (J. Percival). *Archaeological Excavations (Cambr. Archaeological and Ethnolog. Series)*. New York, *Putnam's Sons*. 10 + 80 pp. ill. \$1 net.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Cervantes and Shakespeare*. London, *Milford*, 1916. Royal 8°, 24 pp., 1s. net.

Flosculi Rossalliensis: Greek and Latin compositions by scholars of Rossall School. London, *Cambr. Pr.*, 1916. Crown 8°, 262 pp., 7s. 6d. net.

Francke (Kuno). *Personality in German Literature before Luther*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ.* 9 + 221 pp., ill., pls. \$1.25 net.

Galen. *On the Natural Functions*. Engl. tr. by Arthur John Brock (Loeb Classical Lib.). London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 484 pp., 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Gaselee (Stephen). *The Greek Manuscripts in the Old Seraglio at Constantinople*. London, *Cambr. U. Pr.*, 1916. Royal 8°, 16 pp., 1s. net.

Gray and Moore, *Mythology of all Races* (in 13 v.). Vol. 1. *Greek and Roman Mythology* by W. S. Fox. Vol. 9. *Oceanic Myth-*

ology by R. B. Dixon. Vol. 10. *North American Mythology* by H. B. Alexander. Boston, *A. Marshall Jones Co.*, 1916. Net \$6 per vol. Sold in sets only.

Greek Anthology. Engl. tr. by W. R. Paton (in 5 v.). Vol. 2. (Loeb Classical Library.) London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 515 pp., 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Homer. *The Toils and Travels of Odysseus*, tr. by C. A. Pease. London, *Gardner*, 1916. 357 pp., 5s. net

Horace, Odes and Epodes. Metrical tr. selected by S. A. Courtauld, 2d ed. London, *Bickers*, 1916. 478 pp., 5s. net.

Lewisohn (Ludwig). *Spirit of Modern German Literature*; lectures delivered before Univ. Wisconsin. New York, *Huebsch*. 145 pp., boards, \$1 net.

Livingstone (R. W.) *Defence of Classical education*. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1916. 289 pp., 4s. 6d. net.

Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*. Engl. tr. by George Thornly, rev. and aug. by J. M. Edmonds. Also the Love Romances of Parthenius, etc. Engl. tr. by Gaselee. (Loeb Class. Lib.) London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 447 pp., 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Lucretius Carus (Titus). *On the Nature of things*; metrical tr. by W. E. Leonard. London, *Dent*, 1916. 8°. 313 pp., 4s. 6d. net.

Plutarch, Lives. Engl. tr. by B. Perrin (in 10 v.). Vol. 4. Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Lysander and Sulla. (Loeb Cl. Lib.) London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 476 pp., 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Procopius. *History of the Wars*. Bks. 3 and 4. Engl. tr. by H. B. Dewing (in 6 v.). Vol. 2. (Loeb Classical Lib.) London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 493 pp., 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Robinson (C. E.) *The Days of Alkibiades*; with foreword by C. W. Oman. New York, *Longmans*. 24 + 301 pp., ill., pls., \$1.50 net.

Spence (Lewis). *Myths and Legends of Babylonia and Assyria*. London, *Harrap*, 1916. 8°. 412 pp., 8s. 6d.

Theophrastus. *Enquiry into plants, and Minor works on odours and weather signs*. Engl. tr. by Sir A. Hort. 2 vols. (Loeb Class. Lib.) London, *Heinemann*, 1916. 502, 509 pp., each 5s. net; leather, 6s. 6d. net.

Woods (G. B.). *English poetry and prose of the Romantic Movement*; selected and edited with notes, bibliogr. and glossary of proper names. Chicago, *Scott Foresman*. 18 + 1432 pp., map, \$3.25.

FRENCH.

Bloch (Jules). *La Formation de la langue Marathe*. Paris, *Champion*. In-8°, 10 fr.

Coulon (Auguste). *Le Service sigillographique et les collections d'empreintes de sceaux des Archives nationales*. Paris, *Champion*. In-12°, 2 fr.

Clouzot (Étienne). *Répertoire des sources manuscrites de l'histoire de Paris*. 3 vols. Paris, *Leroux*. In-8°, 15 fr.

Dante Alighieri, *Vita nova*. Suivant le texte critique préparé pour la Società Dantesca Italiana, par M. Barbi. Traduite avec une introduction et des notes par Henri Gochin. Paris, *Champion*. In-8°, 5 fr.

Delfour (L'abbé). *La Culture latine*. Paris, *Nouvelle Librairie Nationale*. In-12°, 3.50 fr.

Haase. *Syntaxe française du XVII^e siècle*. Traduite par M. Oubert. Paris, *Delagrave*. In-12°, 6 fr.; cart. 7 fr.

Renkin (S.) *Grammaire élémentaire du grec moderne parlé*. Paris, *J. Maisonneuve*. In-8°, 3.50 fr.

Uri (Isaac). *Recueil de versions latines données à la Sorbonne et dans les facultés des départements de 1911 à 1915. 1^{re} partie*. Paris, *Hachette*. In-16°, 1.50 fr.

SPANISH.

Bera-Lopez Mendizabal. *Diccionario Castellano-euskera y vice-versa*. Madrid, *Fernando Fé*, 1916. En 8°. Pes. 10.

Enciclopedia universal ilustrada Europeo-Americana. Etimologías sanscrito, hebreo, griego, latin, arabe, lenguas indigenas americanas, etc. Versiones de la mayoría de las voces en frances, italiano, ingle, aleman, portugues, catalan, esperanto, tome XXXII. Madrid, *Fernando Fé*, 1916. En 4°, bound. Pes. 28.

Roman (Manuel A.) *Diccionario de chilenismos y de otras locuciones viciosas*, tome IV, M, N, O, P, Q y suplemento a estas letras. Madrid, *Fernando Fé*, 1916. En 4°. Pes. 15.

Sinonimos. *Repertorio de palabras usuales castellanas de sentido analogo, semejante o aproximado; un vol.* Madrid, *Fernando Fé*, 1916. En 8°. Pes. 4.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Baum (Paul Franklin). *The Medieval Legend of Judas Iscariot.* (Reprint from the Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, Vol. XXXI, No. 3, 1916.)

Biblical Archaeology, The Society of. *Proceedings.* Vol. XXXVIII. Parts 6 and 7. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1916.

Burd (Henry Alfred). *Joseph Ritson. A Critical Biography.* (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. II, Aug. 1916, No. 3.) Urbana, Ill. \$1.15.

Cooper (Lane). *A Concordance to the Works of Horace.* Washington, *The Carnegie Institution of Washington*, 1916.

Dragoumis (Julia A.) *A Man of Athens.* Boston, *Houghton Mifflin Co.*, 1916. \$1.50.

Eastern and Western Review. Dec. 1916.

Ferguson (John de Lancey). *American Literature in Spain.* New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1916. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) \$1.50.

Gaselee (Stephen). *The Greek Manuscripts in the Old Seraglio at Constantinople.* Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1916. 30 c.

Gillespy (Frances Lytle). *Layamon's Brut: A Comparative Study in Narrative Art.* (University of California Publications in Modern Philology. Vol. 3, No. 4.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1916.

Harrer (G. A.). *Consules Suffecti in the years 98-101. Studies in Classical Philology*, XIII, No. 4. Oct. 1916.

Husband (Richard Wellington). *The prosecution of Jesus. Its Date, History and Legality.* Princeton, *Princeton University Press*, 1916. vii + 302 pp. \$1.50.

Hutton (Maurice). *Thucydides and History.* Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. Vol. X, 1916.

Ihrig (Roscoe Myrl). *The Semantic Development of Words for "Walk, Run" in the Germanic Languages.* (Linguistic Studies in Germanic, No. IV.) Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1916. 168 pp. 75 c.

Keller (William Jacob). *Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers.* University of Wisconsin Doctoral Diss. (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin No. 786.) Madison, Wisc., 1916. 192 pp. 40 c.

Loeb Classical Library, The.

Plutarch's Lives, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. IV.

Dio's Roman History, by Earnest Cary. Vol. IV.

Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* by J. M. Edmonds, and Parthenius' Love Romances by S. Gaselee, in one volume.

The Greek Anthology, by W. R. Paton. Vol. I.
 Galen's On the Natural Faculties, by Arthur John Brock.
 London: *William Heinemann*; New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1916. Each volume \$1.50.

McCrea (Nelson). German Literature and Liberation. *Columbia University Quarterly*. December 1916.

Mendell (Clarence W.) Latin Sentence Connection. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1917. London, *Humphrey Milford*. \$1.50.

Modern Language Notes. Vol. XXXII, Numbers I and II. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*. Jan. and Feb. 1917.

Oxford English Dictionary. Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. Vol. X. TI—Z. V—VERIFICATIVE. By W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, Oct. 1916. 5s. net (\$1.25).

Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XII. Edited with translations and notes by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt. London and Boston, *Egypt Exploration Fund*, 1916.

Peppler (Charles W.) The Suffix *-μα* in Aristophanes. Reprint of *American Journal of Philology*, XXXVII (1916), 459–465.

Rand (E. K.) Is Donatus's Commentary on Virgil Lost? *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1916.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXIII. Núm. 2, 3. Septiembre and Noviembre de 1916.

Seligman (E. R. A.) The Real University. *Educational Review*, Nov. 1916.

Shakespeare. Arden Edition. New York, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1916.

As You Like It. Ed. by J. C. Smith, Edinburgh. Revised by Ernest H. Wright, Columbia University. Cloth. xxiv + 200 pp. 30 c.

A Midsummer Night's Dream. Ed. by E. K. Chambers, Oxford. Rev. by Edith Rickert. Cloth. xviii + 185 pp. 30 c.

The Merchant of Venice. Ed. by H. L. Withers, Oxford. Revised by Morris W. Croll, Princeton. Cloth. xxvi + 182 pp. 30 c.

Stampini (Ettore). Studi di letteratura e filologia latina. Torino, *Fratelli Bocca*, 1917.

Studies in Philology (University of North Carolina). Vol. XIII, No. 4. Oct. 1916. Chapel Hill, *University of North Carolina*.

Tavenner (Eugene). Studies in Magic from Latin Literature. New York, *Columbia University Press* (Lemcke and Buechner, Agents), 1915.

Thayer (Mary Rebecca). The influence of Horace on the chief English poets of the nineteenth century. A thesis. (Cornell Studies in English II). New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1916.

Vespucci Reprints, Text and Studies. Princeton, *Princeton University Press*, 1916.

II. The Soderini Letter, 1504; facsimile. 75 c.

IV. The Soderini Letter, Critical translation with introduction by G. T. Northup. \$1.25.

V. The Mundus Novus or Medici Letter translated by G. T. Northup. 75 c.

VI. Paesi Novamente Retrovati and Novo Mondo 1508; facsimile. \$2.

VII. Sensuyt le Nouveau Monde, 1515; facsimile.

Walters (H. B.) A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Mythology. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1916; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. \$6.50.

Winter (John Garrett). The Prodromus of Nicolaus Steno's Dissertation on a Solid Body Enclosed by a Process of Nature within a Solid. An English Version with an introduction and Explanatory Notes. New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1916. 7 plates. 165-283 pp. Paper covers, \$1.30 net.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 150.

I.—RHETORICAL ELEMENTS IN LIVY'S DIRECT SPEECHES.

PART I.

Some knowledge of rhetorical ornamentation is essential for any adequate appreciation of Livy's speeches.¹ A historian

¹ Weissenborn-Müller (ed. 1885), I, 68: "die Glanzpunkte der Geschichte des Livius"; 69: "die Reden . . . die schönsten Früchte der rhetorischen Studien des Livius"; Kohl, Ueber Zweck und Bedeutung der Livianischen Reden, Barmen, 1872, p. 13: "Livius beabsichtigt hat, mit den Reden die äuszere Darstellung auszuschmücken und sein Buch zu einem schönen, Genuss gewährenden Kunstwerk zu erheben"; p. 23: "Die vorzüglichste Quelle der Erkenntnisz bieten die Reden zur Beurtheilung seiner schriftstellerischen Befähigung, namentlich seiner rhetorischen Tüchtigkeit"; Soltau, Livius Geschichtswerk, Leipzig, 1897, p. 16: "Hier bemüht er sich seine eigene rhetorische Kunstmertigkeit zu zeigen"; Moczyński, *De Titi Livi . . . propria elocutione*, Progr. Deutsch-Krone, 1901, p. 5: "contiones, quae in Livii opera exstant, quasi lumina sermonis"; cf. pp. 21-25, where rhetorical figures are treated, but most inadequately. See also Friedersdorff, *De orationum operi Liviano insertarum origine et natura*, Tilsit, 1886, pp. 3-10; Petzke, *Dicendi genus Tacitum quatenus differat a Liviano*, Diss. 1888, pp. 49-80; Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 25 f.; Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der liv. Syntax*, Berlin, 1872, pp. 273-331; Haupt, *Anleit. zum Verständnis der liv. Darstellungsform*, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 35-74; Queck, *Die Darstellung des Livius*, Progr. Sondershausen, 1853, pp. 12-22. Recognition of the rhetorical element in Livy's work has long since advanced beyond Ulrici's statement (*Characteristik der antiken Historiographie*, Berlin, 1833, p. 318): "Livius Schönheit der Darstellung haben viele mit Entzücken bewundert und gepriesen; allein noch niemand hat es gewagt, seine Geschichte als

who, on his own testimony (9, 17, 1), did not accord first place to literary adornment, Livy nevertheless shares in no small degree a thorough knowledge of the *τέχνη ῥητορική* possessed by ancient historians. An attempt has been made elsewhere¹ to show in a general way that by training, sympathy, and literary composition Livy reveals close kinship with the ancient orator. In the present instance there will be brought together and discussed certain conspicuous elements of a rhetorical character²—sententiae and the more important figures of speech—employed by him in direct speeches. These will next be examined to learn what conclusions as to usage may be drawn, both for the separate elements and for their sum total, and for the speeches and speakers individually and collectively; and finally, they will be studied in regard to their availability as a chronological test of Livy's style.

The total number of direct speeches inserted by Livy is large.³ Of these sixty-seven have been examined for this study, nineteen (35 Teubner pages) from the first decade, twenty (43 pp.) from the third, seventeen (38 pp.) from the fourth, and eleven (25 pp.) from the fifth. In general, selection has been confined to speeches—usually the longer ones—which show distinct evidence of effort, speeches in which Livy's rhetorical and psychological art is seen at its best, and in which we may assume he attained most fully his oratorical purpose. For economy in reference it will be convenient at this point to describe the speeches briefly as to setting, and to indicate their place of citation: the speech of Valerius Publicola exhorting tribunes and people in rebellion (3, 17); Capitolinus urging the people to war against Aequians and Volscians (3, 67-68);

Kunstwerk aufzustellen und auszuweisen". See Taine, *Essai sur Tite-Live* (ed. 1910), p. 189 ff., and for a study of Livy's mastery over individual elements of narration, K. Witte, *Rh. M.*, LXV, pp. 270-305; 359-419.

¹ *Class. Jour.*, IX, 24-34.

² These both in variety and number exceed the estimate of Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, I, p. 236 f.

³ In the extant thirty-five books there are four hundred and seven, excluding numerous colloquia (Kohl, *op. cit.*, p. 2). The number in the entire work is estimated by Soltau (*Neue Jahrb. f. d. kl. Alt.*, IX, p. 23) at not fewer than two thousand.

Canuleius advocating legal intermarriage between patricians and plebeians (4, 3-5); Appius Claudius opposing the withdrawal of troops from Veii (5, 3-6); Camillus dissuading from removal to Veii (5, 51-54); M. Manlius exhorting the plebeians to vengeance on the patricians (6, 18); Appius Claudius Crassus refuting the sponsors for the Licinio-Sextian laws (6, 40-41); Sextus Tullius, centurion, protesting against Sulpicius the dictator (7, 13); ambassadors from Capua to the Roman senate (7, 30); Decius the tribune to his soldiers (7, 35); M. Valerius Corvus, dictator, to soldiers in revolt (7, 40); Setinus urging amalgamation of Latins and Romans (8, 4); Setinus and T. Manlius to the Roman senate (8, 5); Pontius the Samnite to his soldiers (9, 1); L. Lentulus exhorting the consuls to accept Pontius' terms of surrender (9, 4); Postumius to the senate on the peace of Caudium (9, 8-9); Pontius to Postumius (9, 11); Sempronius the tribune inveighing against Appius Claudius the censor (9, 34); Decius Mus persuading acceptance of the Lex Oguinia (10, 7-8); Hanno to the senate at Carthage (21, 10); Alorcus urging the Saguntines to accept Hannibal's terms (21, 13); Scipio to his soldiers at the Ticinus (21, 40-41); Hannibal to his soldiers (21, 43-44); Minucius, master of horse, arraigning the policy of Fabius (22, 14); Fabius urging caution on L. Aemilius Paulus (22, 39); a soldier from Cannae pleading for his fellow-prisoners before the senate (22, 59); Torquatus opposing the ransom of prisoners of Cannae (22, 60); Terentius Varro to ambassadors from Capua (23, 5); Calavius the Capuan dissuading his son from slaying Hannibal (23, 9); an ambassador from the remnants of Cannae pleading for service with Marcellus (25, 6); L. Marcius haranguing the soldiers of the late Scipios (25, 38); Vibius Virrius counseling the Campanians not to surrender to Rome (26, 13); Publius Scipio to his soldiers (26, 41); Marcellus to his soldiers after their defeat by Hannibal (27, 13); Scipio rebuking his army for a revolt during his illness (28, 27-29); an embassy from Saguntum thanking the Romans for their services (28, 39); Q. Fabius opposing Scipio's plan for carrying the war into Africa (28, 40-42); Scipio's reply (28, 43-44); an embassy from Locris complaining against Pleminius and his soldiers (29, 17-18); Sophonisba, wife of Syphax, pleading with Masinissa (30, 12); Scipio

rebuking Masinissa (30, 14) ; Hannibal discussing peace with Scipio prior to the battle of Zama (30, 30) ; Scipio's reply (30, 31) ; a Macedonian to the Roman embassy in the Aetolian assembly (31, 29) ; Aristaenus advising Achaean chiefs to accept Rome's alliance against Philip (32, 21) ; M. Porcius Cato against the repeal of the Lex Oppia (34, 2-4) ; L. Valerius for its repeal (34, 5-7) ; Hannibal counseling Antiochus as to war against Rome (36, 7) ; Acilius Glabrio to his soldiers (36, 17) ; Eumenes pleading his claim for possessions taken from Antiochus (37, 53) ; the Rhodians presenting their claims (37, 54) ; Cn. Manlius to his soldiers (38, 17) ; Purpureo and L. Aemilius Paulus opposing a triumph for Cn. Manlius (38, 45-46) ; Manlius' reply (38, 47-49) ; a consul on Bacchanalian rites at Rome (39, 15-16) ; Lycortas the Lacedaemonian answering Rome's ambassador (39, 36-37) ; Philip before the privy council addressing his sons (40, 8) ; Perseus to Philip (40, 9-11) ; Demetrius to Philip (40, 12-15) ; Callicrates to the Achaeans on their treaty with Rome (41, 23) ; Archo to the Achaeans (41, 24) ; Eumenes warning the Romans against Perseus (42, 13) ; Perseus to the Roman embassy (42, 41-42) ; L. Aemilius Paulus to the people (44, 22) ; Paulus to his council (44, 38-39) ; Astymedes in behalf of the Rhodians (45, 22-24) ; Servilius in behalf of Paulus' triumph (45, 37-39).

Of the three kinds of oratory (*genera causarum*) generally recognized by the ancients,¹ iudiciale, demonstrativum, deliberativum, nearly all of Livy's speeches belong to the last mentioned. They are political and legislative in character, *suasiones* or *dissuasiones*, which most readily serve the purposes of the historian. This kind of speech has for its aim *utilitas*,² which plays a part in practically every speech in Livy.³ The

¹ Arist. *Rhet.*, I, 3, 3; *Ad Her.*, I, 2, 2; Cic. *de Invent.*, I, 5, 7; Quint., III, 3, 14; Volkmann, *Rhet. der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig, 1885, pp. 10-24.

² Cic. *de part. or.*, 24, 83: "est igitur in deliberando finis utilitas, ad quem ita referuntur omnia in consilio dando sententiaque dicenda, ut illa prima sint *suasori* aut *dissuasori* videnda, quid aut possit fieri aut non possit et quid aut necesse sit aut non necesse"; Volkmann (op. cit., p. 20): "Ziel und Zweck ist für den berathenden Redner das Nützliche und Schädliche".

³ See Kohl, op. cit., p. 24 f., for an analysis of several speeches (32, 21; 36, 17; 38, 17; 21, 40-41; 5, 3-6; 5, 51-54) which show clear corre-

genus demonstrativum, having to do with matters of praise or blame not under judicial investigation, is represented only by the speech of the Saguntine embassy (28, 39), and by that of L. Aemilius Paulus (45, 41), which latter shows close relationship with the *oratio funebris*.¹ Under the genus iudiciale,² most important in the history of Roman eloquence, may with certainty be placed only the two speeches of Philip's sons before the father (40, 9-15), each accusatory and defensive in substance. The accusation against Pleminius (39, 16-22) is, however, quasi-judicial, since the senate in this instance (as frequently) appointed a commission to conduct his trial.³

spondence with this principle, and with the divisions found in Seneca's *Suasoriae*.

¹ Cucheval, *Histoire de l'éloquence latine* (3 ed.), I, p. 111 f.

² Historians prior to Livy employ most often the *deliberativum*, rarely the *demonstrativum*. The three classes together are introduced first by Livy (Friedersdorff, *op. cit.*, p. 7). That he avoided the *iudiciale*, notwithstanding frequent opportunity for its use, is clear. In the trial of Appius Claudius (3, 56-58) both accusation and defense are almost entirely in *oratio obliqua*. Camillus, without delivering a speech of accusation or defense, goes into exile, we are told (5, 32). Scipio Africanus before the tribal assembly in judicial character (38, 50-52), at the first hearing briefly recites his services; at the second he invites the people to join him in giving thanks to the gods; prior to the third he withdraws from Rome. The avoidance is further observable in numerous cases where plaintiff and defendant use few words, or where we are told in another connection the substance of what they are supposed to have said at the trial. Explanation for this is doubtless to be found, in the cases of Camillus and Scipio, in the recognized incompatibility of representing men of such distinguished services as pleading their cause before the people; in other cases, in a realization that the innovation should be used with caution, or in the wish to observe a proper ratio between indirect and direct speeches.

³ The senate by the appointing of *quaestiones extraordinariae* began early (414 B. C., according to Livy, 4, 50, 6 ff.) to encroach upon the judicial function of the assembly in criminal cases (see Botsford, *Roman Assemblies*, pp. 253-257). But we have no record of a criminal case in which the senate actually exercised judicial powers. Nor could it delegate judicial competence, this being derived from the recognized right of the magistrate who presided over the court so appointed (cf. Abbott, *Class. Jour.*, II, 125).

SENTENTIAE.

Definitions with illustrations are abundant.¹ They are reckoned among figures of speech by some writers,² rejected by others.³ However classed, their employment constitutes an artistic device no less important than the use of figures. The latter, though serving primarily to enhance the force, clearness or charm of expression, aim to affect the *πάθος* of the hearer or reader, while the proper use of sententiae has a twofold result, according to Aristotle. The hearer is always pleased with the expression, in the form of a general truth, of any view which he previously, if only partially, entertained,⁴ and the use of *γνῶμαι* lends character to a speech,⁵ since they reveal the sentiment of the speaker. If the *γνῶμαι* have a good moral tendency, they stamp the speaker as a man of sound conviction. These striking moral statements, of so general an application that they may ordinarily be separated from their context without losing their force, are most effective when short and epigrammatic. The rhetorical advantage won by their use lies in the fact that life and distinction of thought may be gained by the reverse of detailed form, by "the art of putting things", as it were.

The greater number of sententiae used by Livy are those of simple statement, a kind commended by the author of *Ad*

¹ Arist. *Rhet.*, II, 21, 2: ἔστι δὲ γνώμη ἀπόφασις, οὐ μέντος περὶ τῶν καθ' ἔκαστον . . . ἀλλὰ καθόλου· καὶ οὐ περὶ πάντων καθόλου, οἷος δὲ τὸ εἴδος τῷ καμπύλῳ ἀναττοῦ, ἀλλὰ περὶ δυοῦ αἱ πράξεις εἰσὶ, καὶ αἱρετὰ η̄ φευκτά ἔστι πρὸς τὸ πράττειν. *Ad Her.*, IV, 17, 24: "sententia est oratio sumpta de vita, quae aut quid sit aut quid esse oporteat in vita, breviter ostendit"; Quint., VIII, 5, 3 (see §§ 1-32): "est autem haec vox universalis, quae etiam citra complexum causae possit esse laudabilis". These definitions differ only in comprehensiveness, that of Aristotle being most complete. For an excellent discussion of sententia, its connotations and employment, see Holmberg, *Studien zur Terminologie und Technik*, Uppsala, 1913, pp. 8-12; 121-123.

² *Ad Her.*, IV, 8, 11.

³ Quint., IX, 3, 98; Volkmann, *op. cit.*, p. 452.

⁴ II, 21, 15.

⁵ II, 21, 16: ἡθικὸς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους. To a lesser degree the speaker uses sententiae as an appeal to the *θῶν* of his hearers (Volkmann, *l. c.*).

Her.¹ and by Quintilian,² as in Livy 3, 68, 10 *natura hoc ita comparatum est, ut qui apud multitudinem sua causa loquitur, gravior eo sit, cuius mens nihil praeter publicum commodum videt*; 5, 4, 4 *labor voluptasque dissimillima natura, societate quadam inter se naturali sunt iuncta*; 21, 44, 3 *maior spes, maior est animus inferentis vim quam arcentis*; 21, 44, 9; 28, 44, 8; 30, 30, 11 *non temere incerta casum reputat, quem fortuna numquam decepit*; 30, 30, 18 *maximae cuique fortunae minime credendum est*; 30, 30, 19 *meliор tutiorque est certa pax quam sperata victoria*; 30, 30, 20 *numquam minus quam in bello eventus respondent*; 30, 30, 21 *simul parta ac sperata decora unius horae fortuna evertere potest*; 30, 30, 24 *est quidem eius qui dat, non qui petit, condiciones dicere pacis*; 31, 29, 15; 32, 21, 7; 34, 3, 5; 34, 4, 13; 34, 4, 19; 37, 54, 16; 42, 22, 7; 45, 23, 8. Some of Livy's examples are double statements,³ as in 9, 1, 10 *iustum est bellum . . . quibus necessarium, et pia arma, quibus nulla nisi in armis relinquitur spes*; 22, 39, 19 *veritatem laborare nimis saepe aiunt, extingui numquam: vanam gloriam qui spreverit, veram habebit*; 22, 39, 22; 28, 42, 2; 34, 4, 8; 38, 17, 13; 38, 49, 5; 45, 23, 14. In 28, 44, 2 we have a *sententia triple* in predication: *multum interest, alienos populari fines an tuos uri et excindi videas; plus animi est inferenti periculum quam propulsanti; ad hoc maior ignorantum rerum est terror*. By far the larger number of examples are introduced by *asyndeton* (hence the more striking), a conjunction being found only four times: *sed* 25, 38, 18; 28, 27, 11; 30, 30, 7; *sicut* 34, 4, 8. A *sententia* strengthened by a conjunction adding a reason is technically known as an *enthymeme*.⁴ I find two instances: 25, 38, 14 *ad id, quod ne*

¹ IV, 17, 24: "huius modi sententiae simplices non sunt improbandae, propter quod habet brevis expositio, si rationis nullius indiget, magnam delectationem".

² VIII, 5, 4: "esse eam aliquando simplicem, ut ea, quae supra dixi".

³ Cf. Quint., loc. cit.; Ad Her., loc. cit.

⁴ Arist. Rhet., II, 21, 2: *προστεθεῖτε δὲ τῆς αἰτίας καὶ τοῦ διὰ τοῦ διθύμημά ἔστι τὸ ἀταρ*. Cf. Anon. Rhet. Gr., I, 321, 26 (Sp.); Quint., V, 10, 1: "nam enthymema . . . sententiem cum ratione" [significat]; Victor. RLM (H.), 412, 34: "sed enthymema gnomicon hoc a sententia differt, quod ibi tantum simpliciter sententia pronuntiatur, hic autem simul et ratio sententiae redditur". The *sententiale enthymeme*.

timeatur fortuna facit, minime tuti sunt homines, quia, quod neglexeris, incautum atque apertum habeas; 25, 38, 18 sed in rebus asperis et tenui spe fortissima quaeque consilia tutissima sunt, quia, si in occasionis momento, cuius praetervolat opportunitas, cunctatus paulum fueris, neququam mox omissam quaeras. In no case is a *sententia* employed by Livy to introduce a speech (*προμήθιον*) or to conclude one (*ἐπιφώνημα*), usages (particularly the latter) which with ancient writers carried especial weight,¹ and which are often observed by modern writers or speakers. A *sententia* may refer to persons or things,² or to persons and things combined.³ To persons, eight times: 3, 68, 10; 25, 38, 14; 28, 27, 11 sed multitudo omnis sicut natura maris per se immobilis est; 30, 14, 7 qui eas [voluptates] temperantia sua frenavit ac domuit, multo maius decus maioremque victoriam sibi peperit; 30, 30, 11; 30, 30, 24; 34, 4, 19; 45, 23, 14. To things, much oftener, as 5, 4, 4; 6, 18, 7; 9, 1, 10; 21, 44, 3; 21, 44, 9; 22, 39, 22 omnia non properant clara certaque erunt; festinatio improvida est et caeca; 25, 38, 18; 28, 42, 7 non semper temeritas est felix, et fraus fidem in parvis sibi praestruit, ut, cum operae pretium sit, cum mercede magna fallat; 30, 30, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21; 31, 29, 15; 32, 21, 7; 34, 3, 5; 34, 4, 8, 13, 19; 37, 54, 16; 38, 17, 13; 38, 49, 5. To persons and things: see 22, 39, 19; 28, 44, 2 quoted above. Finally, one may detect in

mema is, however, not distinguished from *sententia* by Isid. RLM., 512, 4, or by Cassiod. RLM., 499, 22. See also Holmberg, op. cit., p. 53 ff.

¹ Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 116, 17; Rufin. RLM., 45, 24. More frequently *ἐπιφώνημα* is applied to a striking reflexion used by way of concluding attestation to any involved narration or proof; cf. Quint., VIII, 5, 11 (who cites Verg. Aen., I, 33: "tanta molis erat Romanam condere gentem"); Victor. RLM., 437, 35; Volkmann, op. cit., 455; Holmberg, op. cit., 124. In this sense Livy has sundry examples, as 6, 41, 11 "tanta dulcedo est ex alienis fortunis praedandi", etc.; 26, 13, 13: "tanta aviditas supplicii expetendi, tanta sanguinis nostri hauriendi est sitis"; 26, 13, 19: "haec una via et honesta et libera ad mortem".

² Quint., VIII, 5, 3: "interim ad rem tantum relata . . . interim ad personam".

³ According to Aristotle (l. c.) a universal principle is concerned only with human actions. But the moral character of the gnome makes it applicable to every act and object of human interest (see Cope-Sandys' note). Hence a third class of examples.

Livy's speeches proverbs,¹ or proverbial allusions, now quoted almost unchanged, now in greatly modified form, as 7, 13, 7 cur . . . compressis, quod aiunt, manibus sedeas? 9, 4, 16 et pareatur necessitati, quam ne dii quidem superant; 9, 4, 10 equidem mortem pro patria praeclaram esse fateor; 9, 9, 11; 10, 8, 10 en umquam fando audistis patricios primo esse factos non de caelo demissos; 22, 14, 9; 22, 39, 10 nec eventus modo hoc docet—stultorum iste magister est; 28, 40, 3 scio . . . rem actam hodierno die agi.

Livy's low total of forty-four occurrences, considering the number and length of the speeches from which they are taken, shows a constraint² well in keeping with his preference for unobtrusive ornamentation. Probably no writer in all antiquity of equal popularity and influence has contributed fewer expressions of universal application. Looking at the individual speeches it will be seen that sententiae are used most freely by Hannibal: to Scipio (seven), to his soldiers (two); by Cato (five); Q. Fabius Maximus (four); L. Marcius (two). In this distribution we have an adaptation to the character of each speaker, the use of maxims being appropriate in men of known self-control, of distinction, personal or official, of advancement in years and experience, and of real wisdom withal in the subject discussed.³ This adjustment to character explains why.

¹ Not as numerous as Otto (Sprichwörter, Einleit., p. XXXVI) indicates: "Livius macht öfter von ihnen Gebrauch"; cf. Arist., II, 21, 12: *ἴτι ένται τάχι παροιμῶν καὶ γνῶματος εἰσιν*. Quint., V, 11, 21; Holmberg, op. cit., p. 173.

² Aristotle gives no precept as to desirable frequency. The writer of *Ad Her.* (l. c.) counsels a conservative use: "sententias interponi raro convenit"; so Quint., VIII, 5, 8: "in hoc genere custodiendum est et id, quod ubique, ne crebrae sint . . . et ne passim et a quocumque dicantur". Cf. also Quint., VIII, 5, 25-30, where a middle course is recommended between those who set the highest value on sententiae and those who reject them entirely. Livy's usage is in harmony not only with rhetorical precept, but also with the practice of classical authors (Moczyński, p. 7; Volkmann, p. 453). Cicero's relatively limited employment is dictated by the character of the oration rather than by rhetorical dogma (Holmberg, p. 198). Through influence of the Asian style (cf. Cic. Brutus, 95, 325) sententiae became frequent in Roman usage, and so much the vogue that many considered them the chief source of ornamentation.

³ Arist. (l. c.): *ἀρμόττει δὲ γνωμολογεῖς ηλικίᾳ μὲν πρεσβυτέροις, περὶ δὲ τούτων ὡς ἐμπειρός τις εστιν*. Cf. Quint., VIII, 5, 8.

none are used by Canuleius, Appius Claudius, or P. Sempronius; none by Scipio to his soldiers, Scipio mature but not so celebrated as his antagonist Hannibal, whose speech closely follows; none by the younger Scipio, or the Locrian ambassadors. So may be explained the absence of a single example in the long speeches of Perseus and Demetrius before king Philip, the interest in whose family drama held Livy's admiration so far beyond other episodes as almost to make him forget his duty as a historian.

RHETORICAL FIGURES.

In this paper it will not be necessary to insist on the exact classification of, or shades of resemblance and difference between, figures and tropes. The distinction, frequently pronounced,¹ is again difficult to maintain.² As a practical rule a trope will here be regarded as the use of a particular word in deviation from its normal sense, a figure as an affair of whole clauses or sentences.³ The usual division of rhetorical figures, from Theophrastus on,⁴ is *σχῆματα τῆς διανοίας* (figurae mentis vel sententiarum) and *σχήματα τῆς λέξεως ἢ τοῦ λόγου* (figurae elocutionis vel verborum⁵). By Quintilian⁶ a further division of figurae verborum is made into rhetorical and grammatical, while Fortunatianus⁷ asks and answers: *genera figurarum quot sunt? tria: λέξεως, λόγου, διανοίας.* In the following pages a figure of thought will be regarded as having its basis not in any special combination of words, but in an assumed attitude of the speaker's mind,⁸ while a figure of expression will be considered a combination of words for the artificial expression of an idea.

¹ Quint., IX, 1, 3-7.

² Quint., IX, 1, 9; Volkmann, p. 456.

³ Cf. Jebb, Attic Orators, II, p. 60; Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 11; Quint., IX, 1, 4-14.

⁴ Quint., IX, 1, 17; Aq. Rom. RLM., 23, 5; Donat. Gr. Lat., IV, 397, 5 (K.). See also Volkmann, p. 460.

⁵ The difference is given by Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 69: *τούτῳ δὴ μάλιστα φαῖη τις ἀντὶ διεγνωχέναι, τῷ τὰ μὲν τῆς διανοίας σχήματα, κανὸντα λάθη τις ἀντὶ τοις ἔθμασιν, δμολως μένειν, τὰ δὲ τῆς λέξεως σχήματα οὐχ οἶναι φυλάττεσθαι ὑπαλλαττομένης τῆς λέξεως.* See also Aq. Rom. RLM., 28, 31.

⁶ IX, 3, 2.

⁷ RLM., 126, 24.

⁸ Jebb, (l. c.).

FIGURES OF THOUGHT.

INTERROGATION.

It is designated as *ἐρώτημα* (interrogatio, interrogatum) and *πύστιμα* (quaesitum, percunctatio). The former is used of the sentence question or the question expecting an answer yes or no; the latter expects, if any answer at all, an extended one.¹ The rhetorical question is the most frequent of the figures of thought, and one of the most effective. Its purpose is to embarrass an opponent by virtually asserting the reverse of what is asked. The emphasis of the figure consists in its character as a challenge to gainsay the statement, explicitly or implicitly negative, conveyed by the speaker. Since much depends upon how the question is put, the orator's concern is to formulate the question so skilfully that the answer corresponds to the view which he wishes to assert, and, at the same time, to quicken interest and harmony between himself and audience. Livy's usage is free and varied. Notable in number and effectiveness are the instances (one hundred and six) in which several interrogations follow in immediate succession,² e. g. ten in the speech of Demetrius, nine in that of M. Servilius, six in that of Aristaenius; six examples each in 23, 9, 6; 28, 43, 10; 34, 6, 16; 45, 23, 2; five in 4, 3, 6; 4, 3, 9; 6, 40, 17; 26, 13, 4; 28, 28, 14; 38, 45, 9; four in 3, 17, 2; 4, 4, 4; 5, 52, 3; 5, 52, 14; 8, 4, 2; 8, 5, 8; 9, 34, 12; 28, 42, 17; 34, 5, 8; 40, 9, 11; 41, 24, 17; 44, 38, 10; 45, 39, 13. The larger number of questions (one hundred fifty-three), referring to some special circumstance about which the orator would speak, are accompanied by interrogative pronoun or adverb; in about one-fourth, however, where the question betrays abruptness, disgust, excitability, vehemence, blame, indignation, etc., no such interrogative word

¹ Theon, Rhet. Gr., II, 97, 26: *διαφέρει δὲ τοῦ πύσιμος ἡ ἐρώτησις, ὅτι πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἐρώτησιν συγκαταθέσθαι δεῖ μέντος η ἀρτήσασθαι, οἷον . . . , η διά γε τοῦ ταῦ η οὐ ἀποκρίνασθαι, τὸ δὲ πύσιμα μακροτέραν ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν.* Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 24, 31; Aq. Rom. RLM., 25, 26. The author of Schem. Dian. RLM., 75, 27 reverses the meanings, while Quint. (IX, 2, 6) says: "quid tam commune quam interrogare vel percontari? nam utroque utimur indifferenter, quamquam alterum noscendi, alterum arguendi gratia videtur adhiberi".

² Called *ἐπιτροχασμός* by Donat. (on Ter. Ad., 670). This term, however, is applied to any congeries or coacervatio by Aq. Rom. RLM., 24, 16.

is found; e. g. in 22, 60, 26 the speaker in reply to the proposal to ransom the prisoners of Cannae asks: *et vos redimamus?* So Calavius (23, 9, 6): *unus adgressurus es Hannibalem?* Camillus (5, 52, 3): *hos omnes deos publicos privatosque, Quirites, deserturi estis?* In many cases (some forty), where the interrogative word is wanting (frequently so if the question contains *non*), it is uncertain whether the sentence is a question, an exclamation or an ironical statement, e. g. 4, 3, 13 *paeniteat nunc vos plebei consulis, cum maiores nostri advenas reges non fastidierint, et ne regibus quidem exactis clausa urbs fuerit peregrinae virtuti?* 22, 60, 16 *pretio reddituri estis eo unde ignavia ac nequitia abistis?* 38, 46, 12 *vultis ergo haec omnia pollui et confundi, tolli fetialia iura, nullos esse fetiales?* Frequently *quid?* indicates a rhetorical rise: 22, 14, 12; 26, 13, 4; 28, 41, 12; 38, 49, 2; 39, 37, 11; 40, 13, 3. Or, *quid?* may introduce a question that serves merely as a transition: 3, 68, 3; 4, 4, 1; 6, 40, 12; 28, 28, 11; 34, 6, 7; 40, 9, 13; 45, 23, 7. Where strong impatience on the speaker's part is evident (twenty examples) tandem is added for emphasis to interrogative pronouns or adverbs, as in 3, 68, 3 *quid tandem? privatae res vestrae quo statu sunt?* So the less emphatic *-nam*, as 6, 40, 18 *quaenam ista societas, quaenam consortio est?* 39, 36, 12 *quonam modo, etc.?* 45, 39, 5.

A considerable number of Livy's sentence questions (yes or no type) are rhetorical, especially those accompanied by *non*, *nonne*, *ne . . . quidem*, and *num*. In those with *non* strong affirmation of the positive is made by reason of the hearer's irresistible denial of the speaker's negative question, as 4, 4, 5 *hoc ipsum, ne conubium patribus cum plebe esset, non decemviri tulerunt . . . cum summa iniuria plebis?* 5, 6, 3; 9, 11, 8; 10, 7, 10; 41, 23, 9. In the question with *nonne* the speaker asks negatively about a negative predication, hence affirms with spirit, as 5, 52, 13 *nonne in mentem venit quantum piaculi committatur?* 34, 5, 8. So where *ne . . . quidem=nonne*, 4, 3, 9; 28, 42, 17. With *num* the speaker compels a negative by asking the hearer whether he will stamp as valid a predication absurd or impossible, as in 5, 5, 8 *periculi quod differendo bello adimus, num oblivisci nos haec tam crebra Etruriae concilia de mittendis Veios auxiliis patiuntur?* 5, 51, 7; 5, 52, 6; 38, 46, 12. Double or alternative questions are used rhetor-

ically to assert a negative opinion as to the truth of one or more of the propositions, as in 4, 5, 1 *regibus exactis utrum vobis dominatio an omnibus aequa libertas parta est?* 5, 3, 7; 21, 10, 6; 21, 41, 5; 22, 14, 12; 28, 28, 15 *utrum exercitus exercitui, an duces ducibus, an dignitas, an causa comparari poterat?* 28, 43, 12 is notable for the number of alternatives used. Of rhetorical interest also is Livy's frequent use (some thirty examples) of *an* in the second part of a question (where there is no first part, or where it is suppressed) to mark surprise, indignation, remonstrance, irony, etc., e. g. four times in the speech of Appius Claudius (5, 3, 4; 5, 4, 7; 5, 6, 7; 5, 6, 11), thrice in that of Canuleius (4, 4, 5; 4, 5, 2; 4, 5, 3).

As to moods used in Livy's rhetorical questions, the indicative greatly exceeds the subjunctive.¹ A preponderance of five to one is easy of explanation. The speeches are used freely to characterize the speakers, and the indicative reveals the speaker's plan, ideal, motive, etc., while the subjunctive represents a concession to the will or conviction of persons addressed. The mood of the question is the mood of the expected answer.² Thus, rhetorical questions in the indicative, anticipating an indicative answer in the negative (or its logical equivalent, a positive, if in answer to a negative question), imply a negative opinion on the speaker's part,³ as 3, 67, 10 *qui finis erit discordiarum? ecquando unam urbem habere, ecquando communem hanc esse patriam licebit?* 21, 43, 12; 32, 21, 5. In the subjunctive used rhetorically the speaker anticipates a potential answer in the negative⁴ (or its logical equivalent), e. g. in 9, 34, 12 *quem tu regem sacrificiorum crees?* 22, 60, 14; 23, 5, 13; 28, 41, 5. Included here is the so-called deliberative subjunctive,⁵ used chiefly in questions of the first person (as

¹ The proportion noted is about 250 to 50. The actual number of questions in both moods is much larger, since only the first of a series is counted here.

² Gildersleeve-Lodge, *Lat. Gr.*, p. 295.

³ In the double question, of course, the negative answer (or its equivalent) of the hearer and the negative opinion of the speaker apply to the alternative, not to both propositions.

⁴ Gildersleeve-Lodge, p. 296.

⁵ Under this head Bennett (*Syntax of Early Latin*, I, p. 178 ff.) discusses four types which are seldom differentiated. True deliberatives,

if to conform to the will of the person addressed), and anticipating either an answer in the imperative, or no answer at all. For this usage Bennett (loc. cit.) reserves the name "Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness". Note these instances in Livy: 6, 18, 8 *quid sperem, si plus in me audeant inimici? an exitum Cassi Maeliique expectem?* 7, 13, 7; 25, 5, 5; 28, 43, 18.

Properly considered here also is the figure of the answer,¹ by which the questioner, led along to an advanced step, gives artful emphasis, now by magnifying, now by extenuating, to what has gone before. I have noted about one hundred examples in Livy. In most cases the answer serves simply to reinforce the idea conveyed by the question without answering it directly, as in 3, 67, 11 *satisne est nobis vos metuendos esse? adversus nos Aventinum capitur, adversus nos Sacer occupatur mons*; 5, 6, 4 *ut . . . non aestus, non frigora pati possint? erubescant profecto, si quis eis haec obiciat*; 7, 30, 22; 28, 42, 7; 34, 5, 8; 38, 46, 4; 45, 23, 3. Again, a question is answered by asking another, 3, 67, 4 *quem tandem ignavissimi hostium contempsere? nos consules an vos, Quirites?* 28, 43, 10-12; 42, 41, 11-12. Frequently the speaker, without pausing for a reply, substitutes his own answer succinctly, either to a question represented as put to himself² or asked of another.³ Illustra-

known as the figure of *dubitatio*, διατύρησις, ἀπορία (see Quint., IX, 2, 19; Ad Her., IV, 29, 40; Volkmann, p. 496), of which I find no examples in Livy, are a very small class.

¹ It is variously designated and defined, e. g. Ad Her., IV, 23, 33: "subiectio est, cum interrogamus adversarios aut quaerimus ipsi, quid ab illis aut quid contra nos dici possit, dein subicimus id, quod oportet dici aut non oportet aut nobis adiumento futurum sit aut offuturum sit contrario"; Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 77, 5: ὁπορά δέ ἐστιν δταν μὴ ἔχεις προβαλν δ λόγος, δλλ' ὑποθείς τι δ ὡς παρά τοῦ ἀντιδίκου δ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος διοκρίνηται πρὸς αὐτὸν. Cf. Quint., IX, 2, 12. Union of question and answer is also known as διαλογισμός or διαλεκτικόν (see Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 67; Rufin. RLM., 43, 22; Char. Gr. Lat., I, p. 283 K.). For the visualizing effect of question and answer in Demosthenes, see Longinus, Περὶ Τύπους, XVIII, 1.

² Quint., IX, 2, 14: "ceterum et interrogandi se ipsum et respondendi sibi solent esse non ingratae vices".

³ Quint., IX, 2, 15: "cui diversum est, cum alium rogaveris, non expectare responsum, sed statim subicere: [Cic. Orat., 67, 223] 'Domus tibi deerat? at habebas' . . . quod schema quidam per suggestionem vocant'".

tions of the former are: 9, 34, 14 *quid ego antiqua repetam?* *nuper intra decem annos C. Maenius dictator . . . dictatura se abdicavit*; 22, 59, 18; of the latter: 5, 54, 2 *adeo nihil tenet solum patriae nec haec terra, quam matrem appellamus, sed in superficie tignisque caritas nobis patriae pendet?* *equidem—fatebor vobis . . . —cum abessem, quotienscumque patria in mentem veniret, etc.*; 6, 18, 11; 9, 4, 14. Again, the answer is made to come from hearer or opponent as an objection, *ὑποφορά*, to a question raised by the speaker, e. g. 4, 3, 17 f. *an . . . potiusque decemviris . . . quam optimis regum novis hominibus similis consules sumus habituri?* *at enim nemo post reges exactos de plebe consul fuit*; 5, 52, 5; 5, 53, 1; 6, 40, 9; 6, 40, 18; 9, 4, 12 *quid habent, quod morte sua servent?* *tecta urbis, dicat aliquis, et moenia et eam turbam, a qua urbs incolitur*; 34, 3, 9; 34, 5, 11; 34, 7, 10; 42, 41, 12 *quiescerem et paterer, donec Pellam et in regiam meam armatus pervenisset?* *at enim . . . sed vinci non oportuit eum, neque alia quae victis accidentunt pati*; 45, 37, 9. Finally, the answer is used to convey irony, as 9, 4, 13 *quis enim ea tuebitur?* *inbellis videlicet atque inermis multitudo*; 28, 41, 3 f.; 32, 21, 28; 41, 23, 9. At times this ironical answer is itself in the form of a question, e. g. 3, 68, 4 *quid est tandem domi, unde ea expleatis?* *tribuni vobis amissa reddent ac restituent?*

Sundry rhetorical aims of the question as used by Livy are suggested above. Note further that it is used quite in harmony with the character of the speaker and the end which the speech has in view. It occurs most frequently when the speaker is impulsive and passion rises high, as in the speech of Appius Claudius (fourteen examples); Camillus (eighteen); Appius Claudius Crassus (fifteen); P. Cornelius Scipio, 28, 27-29 (eleven); Cato (nine); Perseus (eight); Demetrius (thirteen). For the opposite reasons it is used but twice each by Scipio and Hannibal in their solemn speeches prior to the death struggle in Italy; three times in the earnest plea for ransom of the prisoners of Cannae, but eight times in the spirited protest of Torquatus against the proposition; not at all by Q. Fabius urging the cunctandi ratio, or by Hannibal or Scipio, discussing with mutual deference and admiration the question of peace prior to the battle of Zama.

IRONY.

Irony is reckoned both as a trope¹ and as a figure.² By irony language in its literal acceptation is the exact opposite of what the speaker says, there being something in the tone, the character of the speaker, the nature of the subject or the attendant circumstances to show the speaker's real drift. Its force consists in its being so unanswerable as to leave no doubt of the falsity of what it assumes as true. It may censure with praise and insult with a compliment, or it may praise under pretense of censure.³ Of the latter use, Livy has one example, 34, 7, 14, where L. Valerius says of the women: *id enim periculum est, ne Sacrum montem, sicut quondam irata plebs, aut Aventinum capiant.* Of the former, examples are frequent, as 4, 5, 3 *scilicet, quia nobis consultum volebatis, certamine abstinuistis*; 5, 4, 12 *scilicet quia levis causa belli est, nec satis quicquam iusti doloris est, quod nos ad perseverandum stimulet*; 5, 5, 4; 9, 4, 13; 32, 21, 28; 40, 14, 5 *ipse quoque minime malus ac suspicax.* Still more frequently the speaker apparently endorses an absurd act, policy or condition, and so sets forth a contrast between the real character of persons and what is said of them or their acts, as in 9, 11, 11 *ita dii credent Samnitem civem Postumium, non civem Romanum esse, et a Samnite legatum Romanum violatum: eo vobis iustum in nos factum esse bellum*; 28, 40, 13 *videlicet ut mihi iam vivendo, non solum rebus gerendis fesso, si huic negata fuerit, Africa provincia decernatur*; 31, 29, 8; 32, 21, 31; 34, 7, 11

¹ Quint., VIII, 6, 54 regards irony as a second species of allegory (called *illusio* § 44 and defined: "aut aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendit, aut etiam interim contrarium"): "in eo vero genere, quo contraria ostenduntur ironia est". Allegory in this wide sense (including irony), called *permutatio* by Ad Her., IV, 34, 46, is likewise defined: "oratio aliud verbis aliud sententia demonstrans". Cf. Tryphon, Rhet. Gr., III, 205; Char. Gr. Lat., I, 276, 4 f. (K.).

² Quint., IX, 1, 3: "ut cum ironia tam inter figurae sententiae quam inter tropos reperiatur"; Aq. Rom. RLM., 24, 21; Rufin. RLM., 61, 36 f. As a figure irony differs from its use as a trope by its greater length, by its greater concealment of the real sense and by the fact that as a figure it may exist without any trope, i. e. in a kind of *ἀντίφασις* or omission; cf. Quint., IX, 2, 44 f.; Rufin. RLM., 62, 16.

³ Quint., VIII, 6, 55: "et laudis adsimulatione detrahere et vituperationis laudare concessum est"; Isidor. RLM., 521, 25.

scilicet, si legem Oppiam abrogaritis, non vestri arbitrii erit, si quid eius vetare volueritis, quod nunc lex vetat; minus filiae, uxores, sorores etiam quibusdam in manu erunt; 40, 9, 1; 42, 41, 3; 42, 42, 2 scilicet ut, quod nunc vos facere queror, urbes occuparem, arcibus imponerem praesidia; 45, 23, 19 id enimvero periculum erat, ne Romanos Rhodii contemnerent.

As a subdivision of irony Quintilian¹ notes *σαρκασμός*, of which Livy has two excellent examples: one used by Appius Claudius Crassus (of whom Livy says, dicitur odio magis iraque quam spe ad dissuadendum processisse), 6, 41, 9-10 volgo ergo pontifices augures sacrificuli reges creentur, cuilibet apicem dialem, dummodo homo sit, inponamus, tradamus ancilia penetralia deos deorumque curam quibus nefas est; non leges auspicato ferantur, non magistratus creentur . . . Sextius et Licinius tamquam Romulus ac Tatus in urbe Romana regnent, quia pecunias alienas, quia agros dono dant; the other by the opponents of Cn. Manlius, who ask indignantly, 38, 46, 12 vultis ergo haec omnia pollui et confundi, tolli fetialia iura, nullos esse fetiales? oblivio deorum capiat pectora vestra; num senatum quoque de bello consuli non placet? non ad populum ferri, velint iubeantne cum Gallis bellum geri? Closely akin also to irony is the figure *παράλεψις* (occultatio, omission, praeteritio) by which, under professed silence, one yet calls emphatic attention to a thing,² as Livy 5, 5, 6; 5, 52, 7; 26, 13, 8 alterum annum circumvallatos inclusosque nos fame macerant, et ipsi nobiscum ultima pericula et gravissimos labores perpessi, circa vallum ac fossas saepe trucidati ac prope ad extremum castris exuti. sed omitto haec. Here and there irony, introducing an objection or exception with nisi, nisi forte, etc., takes the form of a *reductio ad absurdum*, as in 3, 68, 10 nisi forte adsentatores publicos, plebicolas istos, qui vos nec in armis nec in otio esse sinunt, vestra vos causa incitare et stimulare putatis; 5, 3, 7; 21, 40, 7; 22, 59, 10; 22, 60, 21; 28, 41, 4; 40, 12, 17; 41, 23, 9. Finally, to the forty examples of interrogation which

¹ VIII, 6, 57. The distinction sometimes made between irony and sarcasm (exacerbatio, Rufin. RLM., 62, 15), that the meaning of the one is obscure, of the other clearly apparent, is neglected here, where sarcasm is understood in its proper sense of biting irony, plena odio atque hostilis irrisio (Beda, RLM., 616, 23).

² Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 60: *παράλεψις δέ ἔστιν δταν τῷ δοκεῖν τίνα παρατείν λέγη ἡ βούλεται.* Aq. Rom. RLM., 24, 25; Capella, RLM., 478, 3.

may be construed with irony (see p. 136) should be added the following: 4, 3, 7 *si populo Romano liberum suffragium datur . . . stare urbs haec non poterit? de imperio actum est? et perinde hoc valet "plebeius ne consul fiat", tamquam servum aut libertinum aliquis consulem futurum dicat?* 4, 3, 10; 4, 3, 16; 4, 4, 11 *cur non sancitis, ne vicinus patricio sit plebeius, nec eodem itinere eat, ne idem convivium ineat, ne in foro eodem consistat?* 4, 5, 3; 5, 52, 4; 6, 18, 9; 9, 34, 6; 9, 34, 8; 9, 34, 11; 26, 13, 4 *iam e memoria excessit, quo tempore et in qua fortuna a populo Romano defecerimus?*

From Livy's usage as reviewed above it will be apparent that the sharp weapon of irony is employed most freely by those best fitted to use it, by Canuleius (six times), Appius Claudius, Appius Claudius Crassus, and P. Sempronius (thrice), by Q. Fabius Maximus, Demetrius, and Perseus (twice).

CLIMAX.

Climax consists in the arrangement of the words of a series, parts of a sentence, or entire sentences so that the least impressive stand first, while successive parts gradually increase in emphasis, interest, or enlargement of meaning.¹ The force of the figure lies in its recognition of the law that thought to be effective must be progressive. Augmentation may be attained by one step or by several.² Livy's usage shows only the step-by-step class, and no attempt is made to reach such effect of climax as e. g. in Verg.³ or in Milton.⁴ The figure is used by Livy in such moderation as to preserve everywhere his simple,

¹ In this sense the term is *αὔξησις* (Anon. Rhet. Gr., I, 457, 5; Vict. RLM., 169, 23), or *incrementum* (Quint., VIII, 4, 3-9). Climax with this meaning is treated as a division of *amplificatio* by Ad Her., II, 30, 47 f. In the sense usually understood by the ancients, elevation with repetition of the same word, the term is *κλιμαξ* (Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 31, 10; Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 183, 26), *gradatio* (Ad Her., IV, 25, 34; Isid. RLM., 517, 24), or *gradatus* (Rufin. RLM., 52, 29). Such artificial climaxes are rare, and it is not surprising that Livy has no example.

² Quint. (l. c.).

³ Aen., VII, 649: "quo pulchrior alter Non fuit excepto Laurentis corpore Turni".

⁴ P. L., IV, 76 f.: "And, in the lowest deep, a lower deep
Still threatening to devour me opens wide."

unaffected style, the quality of which an excessive employment would tend to destroy. Of single words in climactic arrangement may be cited 8, 4, 11 *audiente non populo Romano modo senatusque sed Iove ipso*, qui *Capitolium incolit*; 9, 9, 5 *vos, tribuni, diceretis et hanc urbem, templa, delubra, fines, aquas Samnitium esse?* 21, 41, 7; 26, 13, 13 *Roma circumseissa, coniuges, liberi . . . aerae, foci, deum delubra, sepulcra maiorum, etc.*; 34, 7, 8. More frequently phrases are so arranged: 3, 17, 4 *tantum hostium non solum intra muros, sed in arce, supra forum curiamque*; 5, 5, 7; 5, 5, 11; 7, 13, 10 *cum vincere cupimus, tum te duce vincere, tibi lauream insignem deferre, tecum triumphantes urbem inire, tuum sequentes currum Iovis optimi maximi templum gratantes ovantesque adire*; 7, 40, 6; 21, 41, 5; 21, 43, 14; 21, 43, 15 *me in praetorio patris . . . prope natum, certe eductum, domitorem Hispaniae Galliaeque, victorem eundem non Alpinarum modo gentium sed ipsarum, quod multo maius est, Alpium.* So clauses: 3, 17, 5; 3, 67, 5 *quippe totiens fusi fugatique, castris exuti, agro multati, sub iugum missi*; 3, 68, 6; 7, 13, 4 *sicubi loco cessum, si terga data hosti, si signa foede amissa*; 7, 40, 6; 9, 1, 9; 21, 10, 12; 25, 6, 18 *non solum a patria procul Italiaque sed ab hoste etiam relegati sumus, ubi senescamus in exilio, ne qua spes, ne qua occasio abolendae ignominiae, ne qua placandae civium irae, ne qua denique bene moriendi sit*; 26, 13, 15; 28, 28, 9; 29, 17, 15; 29, 18, 14; 36, 7, 16; 36, 17, 14. Sentences arranged in climax are: 3, 68, 7 *ante portas est bellum: si inde non pellitur, iam intra moenia erit, et arcem et Capitolium scandet, et in domos vestras vos persequetur*; 3, 68, 13; 4, 3, 8; 4, 3, 10 f.; 4, 5, 2; 4, 5, 6; 5, 4, 13; 7, 30, 19 *vobis arbitur ager Campanus, vobis Capua urbs frequentabitur; conditorum, parentium, deorum inmortaliuum numero nobis eritis*; 32, 21, 23; 45, 24, 12 *omnia libera capita, quidquid Rhodiorum virorum feminarum est, cum omni pecunia nostra naves conscendemus, ac relictis penatibus publicis privatisque Romam veniemus, et omni auro et argento, quidquid publici quidquid privati est, in comitio, in vestibulo curiae vestrae cumulato, corpora nostra coniugumque ac liberorum vestrae potestati permittemus, hic passuri quodcumque patiendum erit.*

In many of the speeches no instance of climax is found. Nearly one-half of the total thirty-nine are assigned to five speeches, that of *Capitolinus* (four), *Canuleius* (four), *Appius*

Claudius (four), Scipio at the Ticinus (three), Locrian embassy (three). Anticlimax (*αὐξησίς* a maioribus ad minora) was not recognized by ancient writers on rhetoric. Of this figure I find no certain example used with intentional (comic) effect, a result quite in keeping with Livy's sober style. However in Scipio's address to his soldiers (21, 40, 9), full of exaggerations about Hannibal and his men, we have: *effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore inluvie squalore enecti, contusi ac debilitati inter saxa rupesque; ad hoc praeusti artus, nive rigentes nervi, membra torrida gelu.*¹

APOSTROPHE AND EXCLAMATION.

These figures are united under the term *exclamatio* by the author of *Ad Her.*² Apostrophe, originally used of turning away from the address to the judges,³ means by extension any turning from the natural course of thought, to address persons or things vividly as if present. It is employed by Livy but rarely,⁴ always, of course, in indication of high excitement, as in 3, 17, 6 *Romule pater, tu mentem tuam, qua quondam arcem ab his isdem Sabinis auro captam recepisti, da stirpi tuae. iube hanc ingredi viam, quam tu dux, quam tuus ingressus exercitus est. primus en ego consul, quantum mortalis deum possum, te ac tua vestigia sequar;* 5, 52, 7 *quid [loquar] de ancilibus vestris, Mars Gradive tuque Quirine pater? haec omnia in profano deserri placet sacra aequalia urbi, quaedam vetustiora origine urbis?* 5, 52, 14; 8, 5, 8 *audi, Iuppiter, haec scelera, inquit; audite Ius Fasque: peregrinos consules et peregrinum senatum in tuo, Iuppiter, augurato templo captus ipse atque oppressus visurus es?* 9, 8, 8 *vos, dii inmortales, precor quae-soque, si vobis non fuit cordi . . . consules cum Samnitibus prospere bellum gerere, at vos satis habeatis vidisse nos sub iugum missos, etc.* In the figure of *exclamation*⁴ (*exclamatio*,

¹ IV, 15, 22.

² Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 61, 28; Quint., IX, 2, 38. The term *aversio* is also used (Quint. § 39; Aq. Rom. RLM., 25, 3).

³ Cf. *Ad Her.* (l. c.): "hac exclamacione si loco uteatur, raro, et cum rei magnitudo postulare videbitur, ad quam volemus indignationem animum auditoris adducemus".

⁴ By some numbered among figures of expression; see Quint., IX, 2, 26 f.; also IX, 3, 97 (against Cic. de Orat., III, 54, 207): "posita inter figuras verborum exclamatio, quam sententiae potius puto".

(ἐπεκφώνησις), the thought strongly felt, or feigned as felt, is indicative of grief, indignation, pleasure, fear, wonder, etc., as in 3, 67, 1, where emotion is heightened by the use of the exclamatory infinitive¹: *hoc vos scire, hoc posteris memoriae traditum iri, Aequos et Volscos, vix Hernicis modo pares, T. Quintcio quartum consule ad moenia urbis Romae impune armatos venisse!* See also 5, 51, 6; 5, 52, 10 *Iuno regina transvecta a Veis nuper in Aventino quam insigni ob excellens matronarum studium celebrique dedicata est die!* 22, 39, 16 *quam diu pro Gereoni, castelli Apuliae inopis, tamquam pro Carthaginis moenibus sedet!* 26, 41, 10 *quot classes, quot duces, quot exercitus priore bello amissi sunt!* 28, 29, 6 *vos ne dici quidem omnia aequo animo fertis! . . . utinam tam facile vos obliviscamini eorum, quam ego obliviscar!* 28, 44, 4; 29, 17, 5; 44, 39, 6. In 28, 42, 2 emotional emphasis is further indicated by confirmatory (asseverative) *ne*²: *ne tibi, P. Corneli, cum ex alto Africam conspiceris, ludus et iocus fuisse Hispaniae tuae videbuntur!*

Of the same general character, but less effective, are numerous interjectional words or phrases introducing sentences used in an exclamatory way, *pro deum fidem*, 3, 67, 7; 44, 38, 10; *me dius fidius*, 5, 6, 1; 22, 59, 17; 34, 5, 13; *hercule(s)*, 5, 4, 10; 5, 5, 12; 5, 6, 12; 6, 40, 15; 28, 44, 12; 29, 18, 12; 34, 3, 3; 34, 7, 5; 38, 46, 6; 40, 10, 8; 42, 41, 7; 44, 39, 1; *mehercule*, 38, 17, 18; *en*, 3, 17, 6; 4, 3, 10; 8, 4, 6; 10, 8, 10; 28, 27, 9; *ecce*, 7, 35, 10. In six of these instances the exclamation is accompanied by interrogation, an evidence of the close original relation of question and exclamation, 3, 67, 7 *pro deum fidem quid vobis vultis?* 4, 3, 10; 5, 54, 6; 10, 8, 10; 42, 41, 7; 44, 38, 10.

Included here, as a species of exclamation, are sundry examples of *προσωποεία*,³ e. g. the introduction of the words of an abstraction personified,⁴ as in 5, 4, 7 *an, si ad calculos eum res publica vocet, non merito dicat, "annua aera habes"*, etc. So, the words of absent persons, e. g. of the Roman people

¹ Cf. Anderson, Class. Phil., IX, 61, 62, 74.

² Anderson, op. cit., 184, 188.

³ Cf. Quint., VI, 1, 25: "prosopopoeiae, id est fictae alienarum personarum orationes"; Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 212, 13.

⁴ Cf. Cic. Phil., XIII, 3, 6: "sin responderit [sapientia]: 'tuere ita vitam corpusque'", etc.; Cat., I, 7, 18: [patria] "loquitur 'nullum iam aliquot annis facinus exstitit'", etc.

(crudelissima ac superbissima gens), 21, 44, 6 “ne transieris Hiberum! ne quid rei tibi sit cum Saguntinis! nusquam te vestigio moveris!”; of Cato, quoting what he had felt inclined to say, 34, 2, 9 “qui hic mos est in publicum procurrendi et obsidendi vias et viros alienos appellandi?” etc.; of the women, explaining their motive for asking the repeal of the Oppian law, 34, 3, 9 “ut auro et purpura fulgamus”, etc.; of the rich matron, opposing equalization in dress, 34, 4, 14 “hanc . . . ipsam exaequationem non fero . . . cur non insignis auro et purpura conspicior? cur paupertas aliarum sub hac legis specie latet, ut, quod habere non possunt, habituare, si liceret, fuisse videantur?” Of an objector, 5, 52, 5 forsitan aliquis dicat aut Veis ea nos facturos, aut huc inde missuros sacerdotes, qui faciant; 6, 40, 8 f.; 9, 4, 12; 21, 10, 11 dedemus ergo Hannibalem? dicet aliquis; 21, 40, 8 “at enim pauci quidem sunt, sed vigentes animis corporibusque, quorum robora ac vires vix sustinere vis ulla possit”; 37, 53, 25 quid ergo postulas? dicat aliquis; of an opponent, as by Purpureo and L. Aemilius Paulus thwarting the ambition of Cn. Manlius for a triumph, 38, 47, 8 “non erant Galli hostes, sed tu eos pacatos imperata facientes violasti”.

That Livy follows rhetorical precept in the matter of apostrophe and exclamation, using it rarely and only in cases of real emotion, is apparent—thirty-nine of the speeches offering not an instance. Further, that his employment of the figures marks the character of the speaker is shown by the number of examples in certain speeches, in that of Appius Claudius, five, Camillus, six, Cato, five, L. Aemilius Paulus, three, and two each in the speeches of Capitolinus, Appius Claudius Crassus, Scipio, L. Valerius, and P. Valerius.

ANTITHESIS.

Antithesis (*ἀντίθετον*,¹ *ἀντίθεσις*,² *contentio*,³ *contrapositum*⁴) is the juxtaposition of opposite parts for the purpose of enhanc-

¹ Anax. *Téχνη Πηγορική*, chap. 26: *ἀντίθετον μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὸ ἐπαντλαν τὴν διορμοστὰς ἀμα καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις έχον η τὸ ἔπερον τούτων.*

Hermog. Rhet. Gr., II, 439.

² Rufin. RLM., 47, 16: *σύγκρισις* sive *ἀντίθεσις*, “comparatio rerum atque personarum inter se contrariarum”.

³ Ad Her., IV, 45, 58: “contentio est, per quam contraria referuntur”.

⁴ Quint., IX, 3, 81.

ing their effect by contrast. Antithesis in its broader significance may extend beyond mere verbal oppositions.¹ Here can be noted only a few details of antithesis, and these apart from its frequency in the figures of chiasmus and anaphora, to be treated below. Writers distinguish antitheses in words, thoughts, and words and thoughts combined. Hence antithesis may be regarded both as a figure of expression, and of thought. But one need consider practically only those examples in which there is an antithesis both in words and thought, in which kind the artistic purpose of the speaker is most apparent. There are few instances in Livy's speeches in which antithesis occurs between single words, as 3, 17, 6 *ego consul, quantum mortalis deum possum, te . . . sequar*; 6, 41, 1 *quo modo extorqueant, non quo modo petant honores quaerunt, et ita maxima sunt adepturi, ut nihil ne pro minimis quidem debeant*; et occasionibus potius quam virtute petere honores malunt; 26, 41, 13 *et hae secundae res illas adversas sustinuerunt*. Far more usual is the contrast between two or more pairs of words or clauses, 3, 67, 5 *non illi vestram ignaviam contempserunt, nec suae virtuti confisi sunt*; 3, 67, 6 *dum nec nobis imperii nec vobis libertatis est modus, dum taedet vos patriciorum, hos plebeiorum magistratum*; 3, 67, 10; 3, 68, 5, 12; 4, 3, 13, 17; 4, 5, 1, 2, 6; 5, 3, 7; 5, 51, 2, 5; 5, 52, 4 *an gentilicia sacra ne in bello quidem intermitte, publica sacra . . . etiam in pace deserit placet?* et pontifices flaminesque neglegentiores publicarum religionum esse quam privatus in sollemni gentis fuerit? 5, 53, 4, 5, 6; 5, 53, 7 *velitisne illos Romanos, vos Veientes esse; an malitis hanc solitudinem vestram quam urbem hostium esse?* 5, 54, 3 *quae vos, Quirites, nunc moveant potius caritate sua, ut maneatis in sede vestra, quam postea, cum reliqueritis, ea macerent desiderio*; 5, 54, 6; 6, 18, 6, 10, 11; 6, 40, 9; 6, 40, 14 *sed omnia semper, quae magistratus ille dicet, secundis auribus, quae ab nostrum quo dicentur adversis accipietis?* 6, 40, 18 *ut duos plebeios fieri consules liceat, duos patricios non liceat, et alterum ex plebe creari*

¹ Nägelsbach (Lat. Stil., p. 634) recognizes in the expression of contrasted clauses "die den Organismus des lateinischen Satzes beherrschende Macht".

necesse sit, utrumque ex patribus praeterire liceat? 6, 41, 2, 6; 7, 13, 9; 7, 30, 12, 13; 7, 35, 11; 8, 4, 10; 9, 4, 14, 16; 9, 8, 3; 9, 11, 9 ut quidem tu quod petisti per pactionem habeas, tot cives incolumes, ego pacem, quam hos tibi remittendo pactus sum, non habeam; 21, 13, 2; 21, 13, 5; 21, 40, 11; 22, 39, 4; 22, 39, 6 ille consul demum et in provincia et ad exercitum coepit furere; hic, priusquam peteret consulatum, deinde in petendo consulatu, nunc quoque consul, priusquam castra videat aut hostem, insanit. In 22, 39, 11-14 we have a series of clauses in nearly every one of which the words are in sharp contrast with the words of the corresponding clauses; so in 22, 39, 20 two series of three members in contrast, malo te sapiens hostis metuat quam stulti cives laudent. omnia audenter contemnet Hannibal, nihil temere agentem metuet. Other illustrations of antithesis in Fabius' speech are found §§ 18, 19, 21. The same in the speech of Torquatus, 22, 60, 8, 16, 25, 26. See also 23, 9, 4 Hannibalem pater filio meo potui placare, filium Hannibali non possum? 25, 38, 12; 26, 41, 6 non ut ipsi maneamus in Hispania, sed ne Poeni maneam, nec ut pro ripa Hiberi stantes arceamus transitu hostes, sed ut ulro transeamus transferamusque bellum; 26, 41, 9; 28, 41, 9 pax ante in Italia quam bellum in Africa sit, et nobis prius decedat timor quam ulro aliis inferatur. Notable are 30, 30, 8, a contrast in four series of four members each, and 30, 31, 7, where Scipio contrasts in seven particulars the conditions of peace, had Hannibal voluntarily left Italy, with those possible after he has been drawn perforce into Africa: ceterum, quem ad modum superbe et violenter me faterer facere, si, priusquam in Africam traiecssem, te tua voluntate cedentem Italia et inposito in naves exercitu ipsum venientem ad pacem petendam aspernarer, sic nunc, cum prope manu consertum restitantem ac tergiversantem in Africam adtraxerim, nulla sum tibi verecundia obstrictus; 36, 17, 4 f., in which, as an encouragement to his soldiers, the Roman consul contrasts as opponents Philip and his army with the aimless Antiochus and his motley forces; 37, 53, 6, where King Eumenes weighs his own claims for recognition by Rome against those of the Rhodians. Still other illustrations, 31, 29, 5; 34, 5, 12; 34, 7, 3, 5, 13; 38, 47, 6 triumphavit, quem non bellum iniustum gessisse, sed hostem

omnino non vidisse inimici iactabant; ego, qui cum centum milibus ferocissimorum hostium signis collatis totiens pugnavi . . . non triumpho modo fraudor, sed causam apud vos, patres conscripti, accusantibus meis ipse legatis dico; 39, 16, 4; 40, 15, 13; 40, 15, 16; 42, 13, 11 hoc quam vobis tutum aut honestum sit, vos videritis: ego certe mihi turpe esse duxi prius Persea ad bellum inferendum, quam me socium ad praedicendum, ut caveretis, venire in Italiam.

Antithesis is used very effectively by Livy when a series of independent sentences are in opposition, six e. g. in 3, 67, 7 f. tribunos plebis concupistis: concordiae causa concessimus. decemviro desiderastis: creari passi sumus. decemvirorum vos pertaesum est: coegimus abire; 9, 11, 6 obsides Porsinnae dedistis: furto eos subduxistis; auro civitatem a Gallis redemistis: inter accipendum aurum caesi sunt; pacem nobiscum pepigistis . . . : eam pacem inritam facitis; see also 4, 3, 15; 5, 4, 11; 5, 6, 3; 5, 53, 3 f., 9; 6, 18, 7, 8; 6, 41, 8; 7, 35, 4; 7, 40, 12; 28, 42, 20 ille consul profectus in Hispaniam, ut Hannibali ab Alpibus descendenti occurreret, in Italiam ex provincia rediit: tu cum Hannibal in Italia sit relinquere Italiam paras, non quia rei publicae id utile, sed quia tibi amplum et gloriōsum censes esse.

Livy's judicious use of these figures is additional evidence of his avoidance of artifice and affectation. In every instance there is real opposition of thought, whether contrasted parts have the same structure or not. Never is Livy so concerned with the how as to forget the what of his discourse. Of the one hundred examples noted seven are employed by Q. Fabius Maximus, six by Manlius, the distinguished patrician, defender of the capitol, four by T. Manlius Torquatus, three by Hannibal to Scipio, two by Scipio to Hannibal, the usage in each case reflecting the age and experience of the speaker, the moralizing character of the speech, as well as its comparative freedom from strong passion. This conclusion is supported by the fact that Camillus, in a speech three times as long as that of Fabius Maximus, and under great excitement, uses but ten examples; further by the fact that Capitolinus and Canuleius use seven each, Appius Claudius, six, and L. Valerius, four.

HYPERBOLE.

Hyperbole (*ὑπερβολή*,¹ superlatio,² exaggeratio,³ decens veri superiectio⁴), usually classed as a trope, is here under the broad definition laid down on p. 134 treated as a figure.⁵ Its force lies in the fact that the hearer feeling the excess as due to emotion shares something of the speaker's emotion. Livy has naturally no examples of hyperbole arising from a contemplation of the sublime, or from the effort to exaggerate a fancy. To lend vividness or impressiveness a real state is enhanced or diminished, the former being the more common. Frequently other figures are combined, e. g. 4, 3, 6 quid tandem est cur caelum ac terras misceant? 4, 4, 4 quis dubitat quin in aeternum urbe condita, etc.? 21, 40, 9 effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore inluvie squalore enecti; see also 5, 4, 12 nos intra vicensimum lapidem in conspectu prope urbis nostrae; 6, 41, 3 omitto Licinium Sextiumque, quorum annos in perpetua potestate tamquam regum in Capitolio numeratis; 21, 40, 10 reliquias extremas hostis, non hostem habetis; ac nihil magis vereor, quam ne, cum vos pugnaveritis, Alpes viciisse Hannibalem videantur; 21, 41, 7 Hannibal . . . vectigalis stipendiariusque et servus populi Romani a patre relictus; 21, 43, 18 cum [militibus] laudatis a me miliens donatisque; 22, 14, 5 sed Poenus advena, ab extremis orbis terrarum terminis; 23, 5, 11 Poenus hostis, ne Africae quidem indigena, ab ultimis terrarum oris; 25, 6, 21 ad Syracusas terra marique geritur res; clamorem pugnantium crepitumque armorum exaudimus; 26, 13, 13

¹ Tryphon, Rhet. Gr., III, 198, 30: *ὑπερβολή ἔστι φράσις ὑπεράριστα τὴν δλήθειαν αἰξῆσεις η μειώσεις χάριν.*

² Ad Her., IV, 33: "superlatio est oratio veritatem alicuius augendi minuendue causa"; cf. Cic. de Orat., III, 203: "augendi minuendive causa veritatis supralatio atque traiectio".

³ Gell., XIII, 25, 9.

⁴ Quint., VIII, 6, 67.

⁵ Cf. Rufin. RLM., 47, 27: "ὑπερβολή aliis tropus videtur: ceterum fit, cum excedit veritatem, sententia". That exaggeration may extend beyond a trope is clear from such an example as Livy, 23, 5, 11 f., Poenus hostis . . . expertem omnis iuris et condicionis et linguae prope humanae militem trahit. hunc natura et moribus inmitem ferumque insuper dux ipse efferavit pontibus ac molibus ex humanorum corporum strue faciendis et, quod proloqui etiam piget, vesci corporibus humanis docendo.

Roma circumsessa, coniuges, liberi, quorum ploratus hinc prope exaudiebantur; 30, 30, 8 et nos ab Carthagine fremitum castorum Romanorum exaudimus.

This examination of Livy's usage has shown that the figure occurs but rarely and only where the imagination and feelings of the speaker's audience are sufficiently aroused to admit it.¹

H. V. CANTER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

¹ Cf. Quint., VIII, 6, 76: "tum est hyperbole virtus, cum res ipsa, de qua loquendum est, naturalem modum excessit". So Longinus (op. cit., XXXVIII, 3) teaches that hyperbole is best, when, through stress of strong emotion, the very fact that hyperbole is used escapes attention.

II.—THE PROSECUTION OF LIFELESS THINGS AND ANIMALS IN GREEK LAW.

PART I.

Among the scenes wrought on the shield of Achilles was a King's demesne on which a corn-harvest was taking place. While armfuls of corn, cut by the sharp sickles, were falling in rows along the swathes and others were being bound by the sheaf-binders in twisted bands of straw, "henchmen apart beneath an oak were making ready a feast and preparing a great ox they had sacrificed".¹ This scene is doubtless—as the scholiast remarks²—a reference to the ancient Athenian festival of the Diipolia, where an offering of grain was accompanied by the slaying of an ox. Let us briefly review the evidence about this little-known festival and its probable origin and meaning.

In his description of the monuments on the Acropolis, Pausanias mentions an image of Zeus by Leochares and another of the same god surnamed Polieus with an altar as standing together.³ He then briefly describes the curious ritual of Zeus

¹ Iliad, 18. 558–9.

² On Il. 18. 483: *καὶ βοῦν φησι* (Homer) *θύεσθαι ἐκεῖσε* (i. e. Attica) *γὰρ πρῶτος θύεσε βοῦν Θαύλων φυγαδευθεὶς*. J. Töpffer, Attische Genealogie, p. 155, first called attention to this scholion.

³ I. 24. 4. An archaic figure of Zeus in the act of hurling the thunderbolt appears on Athenian coins (e. g. Overbeck, Kunstmythologie, II, 19 fig. 4: Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner, Numismatic Comm. on Paus. Pl. BB. 1.), which O. Jahn believed was a copy of the statue of Zeus Polieus, because in attitude it resembles what is considered to have been that of the kindred statue of Athena Polias mentioned by Paus. I. 26. 6; see Nuov. Mem. d. Inst., p. 24. The latter was of wood (Plutarch, de daedalis Platæensisibus 5, p. 20 (Didot), and Apollodorus, III, 14. 6; of olive according to Schol. on Demosth. 22, 13, and Athenagoras, Suppl. pro Christianis 17) and almost a shapeless log (Tertullian, Apologet. 16) and very ancient (Philostratus, Vita Apoll. III, 14), having been set up by the aborigines (Plut. I. c.) or Cecrops (Euseb. Praep. evang. X, 9. 15.) or Erichthonius (Apollod. I. c.); on its form see Jahn, De antiquiss. Minervæ simulacris Atticis, p. 10 sq. Jahn believed the

Polieus. Barley mixed with wheat was placed upon the alter, and an ox, which was kept in readiness, went up to it and ate of the grain. Whereupon the ox was slain by a priest known as the "ox-murderer" (*βονφόνος*), who immediately threw away his axe and fled as if guilty of murder. The citizens, pretending they did not know who had done the deed, brought the axe to trial. In a later passage, in speaking of the Athenian courts of homicide, Pausanias seems to indicate that this trial took place at the Prytaneum, where lifeless things were brought before the bar of justice, a custom which he says goes back to the age of Erechtheus, when the "ox-murderer" for the first time slew an ox.¹

Porphyry gives us an account of the ritual of Zeus Polieus which seems to have been taken almost verbatim from a lost work of Theophrastus. Whereas the scholiast on the Homeric passage mentioned gives the name of the first slayer as Thaulon, Porphyry in one passage² gives it as Diomus, the priest of Zeus Polieus, while in another³ he recounts a divergent story in which the name is Sopatros. His account of the origin of the strange ritual is that a certain Attic farmer, an alien, was one day sacrificing during a general festival, when an ox, on returning from labor, devoured some of the sacred barley cakes (*ψαιστά*) and mixture of meal, honey and oil (*πέλανος*) laid out on a table for sacrifice, and trampled on the rest. In anger Sopatros slew the ox and, after burying it, fled to Crete. A drought visited Attica and the Delphian oracle advised the

similar coin type of later age (e. g. Overbeck, II, 19 and 54, § 7; Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner, p. 137 sq. and Pl. BB. I, II, III; cf. Harrison, *Anc. Athens*, p. 423 sq.) was a copy of the Zeus of Leochares, reproducing in modernized manner the archaic image of Zeus Polieus, and that the altar represented on this type might be the one mentioned by Pausanias; but Overbeck, l. c., doubts if the earlier coin type represents the Polieus, though, on account of the altar, he believes the later type represents the Zeus of Leochares. E. de Chanot (*Gaz. archéol.* VI, 1880, 79-82 and Pl. 11) has brought a bronze statuette at Lyons into connection with the statue of Polieus; cf. Overbeck, *Griech. Plast.*, II, p. 93.

¹ I. 28. 10.

² *De Abstinentia*, II, 10.

³ Op. cit. II, 29; cf. J. Bernays' reconstruction from Porphyry of Theophrastus' work *πεπλ. εὐερεβελας*: Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit, Berlin, 1866, p. 122. In the MS it reads *Διόμοι η Σώπατρόν τινα*, but in Porphyry's source it can have referred only to the latter; see Bernays, *ibid.*

Athenians thus: "If you punish the murderer and set up the ox in the place where he fell, it will benefit both those who have tasted of its flesh and those who have not concealed the murderer". The man was found and, believing he would be absolved from guilt only by getting all the rest to share in the crime by doing the same thing, advised that the city slay another ox in common. He volunteered to do the slaying if he were made a fellow-citizen. This was done and thus was instituted the ritual of the "ox-murder" (*τὰ βουφόνια*), which kept up to a late period as the chief act in the drama of the Diipolia or festival of Zeus Polieus.

In the next chapter Porphyry describes the first celebration of this festival. Maidens, called water-carriers, were appointed to bring water to sharpen the axe and the knife. One man handed the instruments to two butchers, one of whom felled with his axe that one of the oxen among those driven round the altar which tasted of the offerings, while the other with the knife cut its throat. Then the ox was flayed and all partook of the flesh. The next act in the strange drama was to stuff the hide with grass, sew it together and set it up like a live ox yoked to a plough. Then a trial was instituted and the various persons implicated in the murder were successively charged with the crime. "But since the water-carriers accused the sharpeners as more culpable, and these accused the one who gave over the axe, and he accused [the one who struck the ox, who in turn accused] the one who cut its throat, and the latter the knife, hence, as the knife could not speak, it was condemned as the murderer". From that ancient time down to his day Porphyry says an ox was offered in the same wise at the Diipolia: the customary cakes and mixture were placed on a bronze table, oxen were driven around, and the one which ate of the cereals was slain. He adds that the families (*γένη*) of those concerned with the first sacrifice were still in existence. From the man who struck the animal the so-called "ox-strikers" (*βουτύροι*) were descended: from him who drove the oxen around the altar came the "stimulators" (*κεντριάδαι*), while from him who cut the throats of the first ox were descended the "dividers" (*δαιτροί*), so named because they distributed the flesh at the banquet (*δαΐς*). When the judicial process was ended the knife was cast into the sea. In this way

the oracle's bidding was carried out; all had tasted of the flesh, the murderer, i. e. the axe, was punished, and the dead was raised to life.

Aelian also briefly mentions the Attic custom according to which, when an ox is slain, the Athenians try each in turn on the charge of murder, but condemn the knife as the real instrument of the slaying.¹ He adds that the day on which this is done they celebrate a festival called the Diipolia and Buphonia.

Though several things about this very ancient festival are dark, and the sources of our knowledge are not completely in harmony,² we know that the sacrifice thus described was popularly known at Athens as the Buphonia and that it was the chief act in the festival of Zeus Polieus called the Diipolia.³ This civic-religious cult of Zeus was less prominent in Athens than that of Athena Polias—with which it was partly associated—though it was spread widely over the Greek world.⁴ The

¹ Var. Hist. VIII. 3.

² As indicated in the text some of the links in the process of recrimination are omitted by Theophrastus. Pausanias states it was the axe and not the knife which was tried, whereas both Theophrastus and Aelian state it was the knife. Theophrastus shows there were two men who carried out the slaying, the "axe-man" and the "knife-man", and that the former blamed the latter so that finally the knife was condemned. Though no writer says both implements were tried, perhaps both were condemned and thrown into the sea. Furthermore, Pausanias mentions an altar, while Theophrastus mentions a bronze table; perhaps an iron plate was laid on the altar of Zeus Hypatos at first—for blood sacrifices were there forbidden. On the variation in the evidence see A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum*, Leipsic, 1898, p. 517 sq.

³ The forms of the name vary; thus we have *Διπόλια* (C. I. A. IV, I. 555, Aristophanes, *Nubes*, 984), *Διπόλια* (Antiphon, *Tetral.* 2, 8, 8) and *Διπόλεια* (Aristoph. *Pax* 420); in later writers other forms occur as e. g. *Διπόλια* (Porphyry, II, 30). The name is manifestly derived from Zeus Polieus; cf. Hesychius, s. v. *Διπόλεια*. For references in Greek literature to the *Διπόλεια* and *Βουφόνια* (sc. *Ιερά*) see Jahn-Michaelis, *Arx Athenarum*, notes to pp. 52-3; and Töpffer, op. cit., 149 sq.

⁴ From inscriptional evidence, Farnell, in his *Cults of the Greek States*, I (1898), p. 161, n. 107, n-s, shows it was in vogue in such widely separated communities as Paphos in Cyprus (C. I. G. 2640), Sardis in Lydia (C. I. G. 3461), Ilium (C. I. G. 3599), Ios in the Aegean (Ath. Mitt. 1891, p. 172), Rhodes (Rev. Arch. 1866, p. 354) and Phrygia in Caria (Bull. corr. hell. 1894, p. 31). The cult of Zeus Polieus must be dis-

variation in the evidence can be partly explained, perhaps, by assuming with Mommsen¹ that formerly the festival was held not only within the city limits but also outside. As the usages of the ceremony were taken largely from tillage, it must have been at first a country festival. So Porphyry says Sopatros was an Attic farmer and that he slew the ox during a festival at Athens ('Αθηναῖς), which may mean anywhere in Attic territory, and consequently, perhaps, on his own farm, where as husbandman, he would naturally sacrifice to the weather-god Zeus.² Similarly the Homeric passage cited pictures a sacrifice at one side of a corn-field, far from a city. In course of time it would be brought into the city and the chief place of the celebration would be the Acropolis,³ at first probably at the ancient altar of Zeus Hypatos,⁴ but later near the statue of Zeus Polieus. Perhaps the difference in name—Aelian is the only writer who uses the two interchangeably—points to the double origin; the *Βουφόνια* would refer to the country sacrifice, while the *Διηπόλεια* would refer to the urban.⁵ Just as Zeus and Athena were worshipped together at the festival of the Disoteria at Athens, the connection of which with the Diipolia is recog-

tinguished from that of Zeus *Πατρός* as it does not connote the bond of kinship, but the union of the state; the cult of Zeus *Πάτημος*, which expressed the political union of the state also, was late and is known to us through an inscription of Hadrian's time (C. I. A. III, 7), and imperial coins of the Phrygian town of Synnada; see Head, *Historia Numorum* (ed. 1911), p. 686, and cf. Farnell, p. 56 and n. 1.

¹ Feste, p. 517 (and n. 1) sq.

² Op. cit. II, 29.

³ As Pausanias, Porphyry and Suidas (s. v. *Βουφόνια*) say.

⁴ Paus. I. 26. 5 says this altar stood in front of the entrance to the Erechtheum and that no living thing was there sacrificed; cf. also Eusebius, Praep. evang. X. 9. 15; on its location see Lolling, *Topogr.* p. 347, 1. It has also been assumed that the festival took place on the Pnyx, because of a votive inscription found there [Διτ̄ υψ]ιστ[φ εύ]χῃ; see Curtius, *Attische Studien*, I, p. 27, but there is no proof that this cult was ancient; cf. Lolling, 331, 1.

⁵ Cf. Mommsen, 517, n. 1. The festival was also confounded with the Diasia (*τὰ Διάσια*), the festival of Zeus Meilichios held on the 22d or 23d of Anthesterion; see Schol. on Aristoph. *Nubes* 408 and 984: Bekker, *Anecd. gr.* 91, 8-9. The latter says Thucydides calls the festival by that name; but the historian, I, 126, speaks of the festival of Zeus Meilichios, which had nothing to do with the Diipolia.

nized,¹ there is also evidence to show that both divinities were united in some degree in the city ceremony of the Diipolia.² While in the country a sacrifice to the weather-god alone would be sufficient, it was natural, after the festival was brought into the city, that the "Guardian" Athena should be honored at the same time as the "Guardian" Zeus at the latter's altar on the Acropolis.³ The chief actor at the city celebration seems to have been the "ox-slayer" (*Βουφόνος* or *Βουτύκος*), the priest who annually performed the traditional rôle of Sopatros.⁴ For centuries these priests were chosen from the Attic family of the Thaulonidae, who traced descent from a mythical Thaulon, the first ox-slayer.⁵

¹ It was founded about 480 B. C.: see C. I. A. II, 1. 305, l. 10: II, 1. 325; for the younger festival of the same name at Piraeus see II, 141. 4 and IV, 2. 373 c; cf. Mommsen, *Feste*, 524 sq. It took place probably at the stoa of Zeus Eleutherios in the agora; see Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, II, 425; cf. citations from Hesychius, 524. 3. Böckh (app. C. I. G. I, p. 251) believed the offering to Zeus Soter was made on the same day as that to Zeus Polieus; this view is found reasonable by Mommsen, pp. 526-7, who dates the Disoteria somewhere between the 20th of Thargelion and the 21st of Scirophorion. That Athena and Zeus, the divinities of the Disoteria, also took part in the Diipolia strengthens Böckh's opinion, and the coincidence in the dates of the two festivals leads to the conclusion that many oxen were slain at the *Βουφόνια*, as is stated by the *Etym. Magn.* s. v. *Βουφόνια*, and Bekker, op. cit. 221, 2-3; in other words the many oxen were slain on the day (*ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*) of the Diipolia, not as offerings to Zeus Polieus, but to Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira. After the ox was slain on the Acropolis at the Diipolia, the people moved down to the Prytaneeum for the sacrificial meal, and thence to the stoa of Zeus in the agora below.

² Thus in the Venetus MS. of Aristophanes' *Nubes*, 985, we have after the words *καὶ Βουφόνιων* the memorandum *ἔσπη ἦτι παρὰ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπιτελουμένη τῇ Ἀθηνῇ*, which words show Athena's connection: Hesychius, p. 426 (s. v. *Διός θάκος καὶ πεσσός*), says also that when Athena and Poseidon were striving for the land of Attica, the former promised Zeus for his vote in her favor to sacrifice the first offering on the altar of Zeus Polieus.

³ Leake placed the altar of Zeus Polieus at the western end of the Parthenon, Beulé at the eastern; now it is generally believed to have stood at the eastern end, perhaps a little to the north; see Milchhöfer, *Schriftquellen zur Topographie von Athen* (Curtius, *Stadtgesch. von Athen*, p. XLIII, 48-9); and cf. Frazer, *Pausanias*, II, p. 303.

⁴ Cf. Bekker, op. cit. 221, 1; the other two performers seem to have been secondary figures.

⁵ As already remarked, the name Sopatros comes from a source only

The festival of the Dipolia in course of time became antiquated in Athens. By the time of Aristophanes it appeared to be as much out of harmony with the taste of the day as the golden cicadae which the old Athenians used to wear.¹ Several pre-Euclidean inscriptions show that it still existed to the end of the fifth century.² The priest of Zeus Polieus had a seat in the theater of Dionysus to the left of the god's priest.³ But we hear nothing of the festival in the fourth, third, second or first centuries B. C. First again under Roman dominion, when the old and antiquated were in special favor, we learn of it being solemnized in the days of Pausanias and Porphyry. Whether we are to conclude that in these middle centuries the ceremony entirely ceased or was continued, though ignored and despised, we cannot say. The later richer customs of the worship of Zeus had contributed their part to the public taste

handed down by Theophrastus. For the Thaulonidae, see Schol. on Aristoph. *Nubes* 985; Suidas, s. v. Θαύλων; Hesychius Θαυλωνίδαι, Βουτύνος and Βούτης. Hesychius confounds βουθύνης, "ox-sacrifier" (cf. Suidas, s. v. βουθύνης; Athenaeus 660A; Sophocles, *Oed.* Col. 888), with the Athenian hero Βούτης, neatherd priest of Athena and Poseidon and ancestor of the priestly caste of the Βουτάδαι and Ετεοβουτάδαι (cf. Apollod. III, 15, 1; Paus. I, 26, 5; Ps.-Plut., *Vit. Lycurg.* orat. p. 843 e [Lycurgus was an Eteobutad]; Aeschin. II, 147; Harpocrat. and Phot., s. v. Ετεοβουτάδαι; C. I. A. III, 2, 302 "ιεπτεύς βούτου", which may refer to the priest or the hero or only be a title). The Βουτάδαι can have had nothing to do with the Βουφόνια or Βουτύποι, as Hesychius affirms: see Töpffer (on basis of Suidas, s. v. Βούτης), p. 158; Mommsen, pp. 520-2; etc. Photius (s. v. Κερυκάδαι) says these latter were πατρίδι Κηρύκων, i. e. one of the branches of the great priestly family of the Ceryces at Athens (cf. Andoc. 15, 28; Paus. I, 38, 3; Pollux, VIII, 103; Photius, s. v. Κηρυκίδαι and see Töpffer, p. 151). Clidemus (= Clitodemus of Paus. 10, 15, 5), an old Attic historian, quoted by Athenaeus 660 A, says the βουτύποι and μάγειροι (= probably the δακτροί of the Dipolia) belonged to the Ceryces; perhaps the Κήρυκες of the Homeric passage quoted (Il. 18, 558; cf. schol. = 'Αθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ σὺν τούς περι ιερουργύλας πονουμένους κήρυκάς φασι) also belonged to them. For an explanation of the variation in names, see Töpffer; he believes the chief actor (βουφόνος) was from Thaulon's race, while the βουτύπος was a secondary figure and came from the Ceryces; Mommsen, p. 521, sees no reason for making two persons out of these titles.

¹ *Nubes*, 984-5: ἀρχαῖα γε καὶ Διπολιάδη καὶ τεττήγων ἀνάμεστα, κ. τ. λ.

² C. I. A. I, 149; II, 649, l. 12; 652, l. 48; 660, l. 22-23; IV, l. 555a.

³ C. I. A. III, 242.

and so the archaic festival of the Diipolia must have lost in prestige, at a time when the splendid pomp of such festivals as the Disoteria¹ was more agreeable to the people than these old-fashioned rites.

If we seek an explanation of the strange rites of the Diipolia, we must go far back into the domain of primitive ideas which everywhere form the background of early ritual. And, as we shall see, it is only in recent years that light has been thrown upon the ideas which are at the base of this curious drama. The account of Pausanias is incomplete and he makes no effort to explain what he certainly did not understand. The story of Porphyry is frankly aetiological and of little value beyond pointing to a remote antiquity for the origin of the festival. He seems to have regarded it—to quote from Farnell—"as a mystic allusion to the guilty institution of a bloody sacrifice, and to the falling away of mankind from a pristine state of innocence, when animal life was sacred and when the offerings to the gods were harmless cereals or vegetable oblations"—in short "the explanation of a vegetarian defending a thesis".² His mistake seems to have been due to the popular notion, already long before inculcated in the poems of Hesiod, of a Golden Age, when men were content to live on the earth's fruits and had not yet learned to shed blood; also in part to an effort to explain some of the features in the ritual of animal sacrifice, e. g., the acknowledgement of guilt on the part of the slayer.

Various explanations of the ritual of the Diipolia have been advanced in recent years. Mommsen,³ chiefly on the basis of two passages in Pausanias, places the origin of the festival on the borderland between two periods: the Cecropian, when grain and cakes instead of blood sacrifices were offered on a bronze table on the Acropolis,⁴ and that of Erechtheus, who disturbed

¹ Inscriptions tell us the amount of money spent on this festival; thus C. I. A. I, 157 (for Olympiad CXI, 3) states that 1050 drachmae were expended for Zeus Soter; C. I. A. II, 842, gives 2610 drachmae: later inscriptions show the ephebi had to do with it.

² *Cults*, I, p. 88.

³ Feste, p. 512 sq.: his theory first appeared in his *Heortologie*, 1864, pp. 449-54.

⁴ 8. 2. 3; cf. 1. 26. 5; he believes they were offered on the altar of Zeus Hypatos whose bloodless ritual was instituted by Cecrops. Other such bloodless altars are mentioned; thus Porphyry, II, ch. 27, says

the innocence of an earlier time by sacrificing an ox at the altar of Zeus Polieus.¹ During the earlier stage the slaying of an ox was a sin and so the Buphonia was literally an "ox-murder", which he thinks explains the slayer's flight and the subsequent process to find out who was to blame.² As the festival fell during the last full moon of the Attic year (on the fourteenth of the month Sciophorion³), i. e. the end of June or the beginning of July, its celebration would correspond with the threshing season in Attica.⁴ Hence Mommsen concludes that the Diipolia was merely a threshing festival. At this date now the corn-harvesting is already advanced and the cut ears lie on the threshing floors to be trampled out by oxen which are driven about. Unless their mouths are bound the oxen will devour the grain, the very thing which they are said to have done in the days of Sopatros. Thus, apart from thanksgiving, the purpose of the festival was to implore favorable weather conditions for the threshing and winnowing, and as Zeus was the god of the weather, it was primarily dedicated to him.⁵

This reasoning of Mommsen is by no means convincing. The fact that the festival fell about the end of the Attic harvest certainly shows that it was in some wise connected with tillage, as a harvest commemoration, but it does not explain the strangeness of the ritual. Nor is the view of K. Bötticher any more convincing, who, following the explanation of Theophrastus, believed that the change from the sacrifice of

anciently men neither ate nor sacrificed animals; and in ch. 28 names an "altar of the Pious" at Delos where no animals were slain; cf. also Plato, Laws, VI, 782 C and Lobeck, Aglaophamus, p. 245 sq.

¹ I, 28, 10.

² Cf. Schol. on Il. 7, 466 (on 'Βουφόνεον') : *Βουφοεῖν ἐστιν οὐ τὸ θύειν θεοῖς· ἀτοπος γὰρ ἐπὶ θυσίας φόνον λέγειν· ἀλλὰ τὸ φονεῖν βοῦς εἰς δείπνου παρασκευήν.*

³ Schol. Aristoph. Pax, 419: Etymol. Magn. s. v. *Βουφόνια*. On the 16th, according to Bekker, 238, 22-3. Similarly until recently it was held that the Olympic games in honor of Zeus fell during the first full moon after the summer solstice, i. e. about July 1st. Recent writers place them after the second full moon, i. e. the end of July or beginning of August; Unger, Philol. XXXIII (1874), p. 227 sq.; A. Mommsen, Ueber die Zeit der Olympien, Leipsic, 1891.

⁴ Mannhardt, Mytholog. Forsch. p. 68.

⁵ Feste, 522-3; cf. 12-13.

fruits and cereals to that of animals was an innovation tremendous enough to explain the guilt of the slayer, the trial of the axe and the entire ritual.¹ It must be admitted that we do find, both in the ritual of Zeus and other divinities,² the occasional distinction between bloodless offerings and sacrifices which shed a victim's blood. Thus Pausanias says only cakes and neither animals nor wine were allowed on the altar of Zeus Hypatos³ on the Acropolis, but he also says a human babe was sacrificed on the altar of Lycaean Zeus at Lycosura in Arcadia.⁴ Wineless sacrifices were only innocent in the sense that they excluded animals,⁵ and they were offered not only to Zeus Γεωργός, the god of agriculture, but to other divinities, including Aphrodite Ourania and Dionysus.⁶ Such sacrifices could not therefore have been associated with the oldest period, as Theophrastus would have us believe, for the two divinities just mentioned were not primitive Greek.

W. Robertson Smith was the first to emphasize that in Greek as well as Semitic religions, we must distinguish between the offerings of the first fruits of the harvest placed on an altar as tribute, and the sacrifice at which—by means of a common sacrificial meal—the whole tribe was brought into union with its god.⁷ His contention that the latter was the earlier custom is probably right, if for no other reason than that the agricultural follows the nomadic period. Down to the close of Greek religion animal sacrifices formed the chief feature of the ritual of Zeus and so no reform, like that hinted at by Theophrastus, ever took place. Zeus always remained the

¹ Philol. Suppl. Bd. III (1878), pp. 351 sq.: cf. Philol. XXII, p. 262 sq. Bötticher's contention is that the tradition of Pausanias is true that blood sacrifice first appeared in Athens in the regal period; that the new sacrum was added to the Diipolia with the introduction of the cult of Athena, who first sacrificed an ox, though before neither steer nor plough-ox is mentioned in her cult: cf. Arnobius, VII. 22 and Crestus, ap. Fulgentium, Exposit. Serm. Antiq., p. 561: also Il. 6, 308-9; 10, 292; Od. 2, 550.

² e. g. Apollo on Delos: see Diog. Laert. 8. 13.

³ I. 26. 5.

⁴ 8. 2. 3.

⁵ Plutarch, Symp. Quaest. 4. 6. 2, identifies them with *μελισπονδα* or "honey libations".

⁶ Farnell, Cults, I, p. 88.

⁷ Religion of the Semites, 2 (1894), 218-227.

“cutter up of entrails” (*στλαγχνοτόμος*)¹ and a “feaster” (*εὐλαπιναστής*).² Doubtless occasional bloodless sacrifices to Zeus would appear to some of the higher natures of the Greeks as a more spiritual conception of sacrifice and a purer form of ritual, but so far as we know the ritual remained practically unchanged to the end of paganism.³

Scientific theories of sacrifice are very recent, dating only from the second half of the last century, and originated in the first instance with the English school of anthropologists. Let us, therefore, very briefly review the theories of sacrifice and their bearing on the buphonia advanced by the three recent English investigators of primitive religious beliefs, Robertson Smith, Frazer and Farnell.

Robertson Smith tried to explain the mysterious rites by the survival of early totemistic ideas, i. e. the belief in an animal ancestor of a clan or of tribal kinship with a sacred animal. Whereas Tyler had maintained that sacrifice was originally merely a gift offered the gods by men to win their favor and curb their enmity—the gift slowly becoming transformed into one of homage, which in turn became one of renunciation, Smith, on the basis of the recently recognized existence of totemism, distinguished three types—the honorific, piacular and mystic. The essential feature of the first was that the god and worshippers shared in the sacrifice and so became commensals or table companions, the sacrificial meal renewing the bond between them and the victim which originally was the animal of a hostile totem-kin: the second arose from the need of atoning for bloodshed within the kinship group, where the culprit, if found, was punished, and if not, a substitute, i. e. the non-human member of the totem-kin, the totem animal: in the third, traced back to the same cycle of ideas as the second, the god himself is slain and eaten by the worshippers.⁴ In his theory later remodeled to meet objections raised, he made god, victim and human group all of one kin, and the animal or totem

¹ Athenaeus, 147 A.

² This was his name in Cyprus; Athen. 174 A. In the Iliad this is the name given to Hector's friend Podes; 17, 577.

³ Human sacrifice lingered on in certain parts of the Roman empire down to Hadrian's age: cf. Porphyry, II, 54-7.

⁴ See article “Sacrifice”, Encycl. Britannica, 9th ed.

the earlier form of the god, and the sacrifice originally a communion in which god and worshippers have a bond of kinship; from this communal sacrifice piacular sacrifices grew, explained by the idea of the mystic union of god and worshippers. In short the essential feature of his reasoning is that a group claims kindred with an animal god or a sacred animal, from whose flesh the group abstained except on certain ceremonial occasions when it is eaten to strengthen the tie of kinship. In applying his theory to the buphonia,¹ he emphasized, as Bötticher had done, the literal meaning of the word *βουφόνια*, the sense of guilt which rested on the slayers in the efforts of all concerned to shift the blame, the exile of the priest who dealt the blow, and the legend (in Theophrastus) which connected these rites with the admission of a stranger into the community, and the subsequent trial of the axe. He concludes that the ox was a sacred animal or totem, whose slaying was sacrilegious—a divine animal akin to the clan, so that the buphonia is a reminiscence of a primitive age when oxen—and perhaps all herds—were sacred.² Similar rituals to that of

¹ *Relig. of the Semites*, p. 304 sq.

N. W. Thomas, in his article on Sacrifice, in the Britannica (11th edition), has combated the commensal doctrine of Smith, denying it was a primitive right of adoption. He believes the custom of eating the victim's body does not necessarily spring from any idea of communion with the god, for it may arise from a desire to incorporate sanctity which has been imparted to it—which is based on the idea that eating anything causes its qualities to pass into the eater. When the victim—like the corn-spirit—is an animal especially associated with the god, the god may be said to be eaten, though even here there is no indication of giving a portion of the victim to the god.

² According to classical writers the plough-ox could not be slaughtered because he was himself an agriculturist and so a companion to the laborer at his work; so Ael. V, 14; Varro, *de re rust.* II, 5, 3. Both Varro, § 4, and Columella, *de re rust.* c. VI. Praef. 7, state that the slaying of an ox was prohibited at Athens on pain of death. Frazer, Pausanias, II, p. 304, thinks these statements were inferred from the ritual of the buphonia; but they were more probably merely reminiscences of an older period when such animals were sacred. Herodotus says the Libyans and Egyptians abstained from cow's meat though they sacrificed bulls; IV, 186; cf. II, 41; a similar statement is made for Phoenicia by Porphyry, *de abstinentia*, II, 11. Pliny says the slaughter of a laboring ox in Rome in the early days was punished with excommunication: H. N. 8, 70. The old idea has survived in some parts

the Diipolia existed in other parts of Greece, e. g. the sacrifices to the Syrian goddess described by the pseudo-Lucian,¹ and the worship of Zeus Lycaeus in Arcadia already mentioned.²

Frazer's views of sacrifice, though partly based on those of Smith, are somewhat different. He does not believe it has been proved that totemism ever existed among the Greeks or any of the Aryan peoples. He believes a truer explanation of the buphonia is to assume with Mannhardt³ that the ox, instead of being a totem animal, was a vegetarian spirit. He thinks the festival must have been a harvest one, as the ritual of placing fruits and barley on an altar is in harmony with such a feast, as is also the sacramental character of the repast of which all partook, exactly as is done in modern Europe. The traditional origin of the feast—to avert sterility—also points to the same conclusion. His view of sacrifice is, that while the sacrifice of the god may have been piacular, it was also intended to preserve his divine life against decay of age. He exemplifies his theory by two sorts of cases; first the slaying of the man-god which is frequently the king; secondly the annual slaying of the representative of the spirit of vegetation, or corn-spirit. He finds the explanation of the buphonia in the latter sort. The mode of selecting the victim suggests that the ox which tasted the corn was looked upon as a corn deity, whose flesh was ceremonially eaten, and which was slain at the end of the harvest only to rise again with increased powers of production. The setting up of the stuffed hide and the yoking to the plough are comparable to the resurrection of the tree-spirit in the person of its representative.⁴

of Greece into modern times; see G. Mariti, *Travels through Cyprus, Syria and Palestine* (1791-2) I, 35.

¹ *De dea Syria*, 58: in these rites the worshippers sacrificed by throwing animals from the top of the propylaea of the goddess's temple and even cast down their own children, "calling them oxen".

² Cf. Farnell, p. 92: he sees in this Zeus the "Wolf-God" of a wolf-clan, i. e. the Lycaonids, in whose legends human sacrifice and lycanthropy were prominent.

³ *Op. cit.* pp. 58 sq.

⁴ *Golden Bough* 295 sq.: cf. Pausanias II, 304. On pages 295-6 he cites a similar custom of our day at Beauce, France, where on the 24-5th of April of each year the peasants make a straw man (called the "Great Mondard") in the belief that the old one is dead. It is carried

Ingenious as Frazer's theory is in explaining many features of the buphonia, it is not satisfactory. He has gathered evidence to prove that many primitive peoples look upon the ox as a vegetation divinity, and he even mentions a present-day Chinese custom of making an effigy of an ox stuffed with grain, which is an almost exact duplicate of the Athenian custom; and he has given proof of the religio-political significance of the ox in Attic worship, especially in the cult of Zeus.¹ And without reference to totemism he explains how a primitive tribe may look upon an animal as divine, conciliate it and make reparation for slaying it, e. g. to avoid a blood-feud with its kindred. But his solution hardly explains why the slaying of the first ox at Athens should have aroused so deep a sense of guilt, when no such feeling is evidenced elsewhere in the slaying of the corn-spirit. It certainly does not explain the flight of the slayer nor the trial of the axe.

Farnell² agrees with Smith that a survival of totemism—which he looks upon as only a special form of the larger fallacy peculiar to primitive men of endowing animals with human characteristics—best explains the ritual of the buphonia. The feeling of guilt on the part of the slayer is explained by assuming that the ox was regarded as being of the same kindred as the worshippers: thus he would have felt the same sense of guilt as if he had slain one of his own kindred and so would have gone into voluntary exile. He believes this assumption is confirmed by that part of the legend which made the admission of Sopatros into citizenship dependent upon his eating of the flesh of the ox with the other citizens at the sacrificial feast;

in procession through the town and hung on the oldest apple-tree until the apples are gathered, when it is burned or cast into the river. The man who plucks the first fruits of the tree becomes the "great Mondard" or representative of the tree-spirit. He explains this curious custom on the ground that primitive folk fear to taste the first fruits of a crop until a ceremony has made it pious to do so, since they belong to a divinity; whoever dares to take them is the god in human form.

¹ Two inscriptions, C. I. A. III, 71 and 273, show that the Zeus of the Palladium homicide court was served by a priest called *βουζύης*—“yoker of oxen”. We know the bull and the ram were the chief victims sacrificed to Zeus.

² *Cults, Appendix to ch. IV, pp. 88 sq.*

for thereby he became of one flesh with them. To harmonize this theory with that of Frazer, we must suppose that in this case the deity of vegetation—personified as an ox—had been taken as a totem by an agricultural tribe. We have already seen that the festival indicates that Zeus originally was an agricultural deity. Both Smith and Frazer have collected evidence to show the primitive custom of slaying the god in the form of a divine animal and the eating of its flesh. Hartland also, in his *Legend of Perseus*,¹ believes that when a religious community is at the same time a family, clan or tribe in early society, each member of the kin testifies and renews his union with the rest by taking part in a sacrificial meal in which the totem god is eaten by the worshippers. Frazer, however, believes that no satisfactory evidence has been adduced in support of this theory, and so rejects the totemistic solution.² If the Greeks ever based their society on totemism—which Frazer denies—Farnell admits they had left that stage far behind before the historic period,³ but he believes the traces of an institution which has long disappeared can be found both in legends and ritual, and thus concludes: “When we find indications that the animal that is venerated and occasionally sacrificed, is regarded as akin to the worshipper, the survival of totemism here is the only hypothesis that seems to provide a reasonable key to the puzzle”.⁴ Whether the ultimate solution of the buphonia is to be found in totemism or some other primitive fact, Farnell believes that certain traces of the “theanthropic”⁵ animal are well attested in the ritual of Zeus.

¹ (1894-6), II, 236.

² Westermarck also follows Frazer's idea: *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, II (1908), pp. 210-11.

³ Descent through females, a fact generally found with totemism, also cannot be proved to have existed anywhere in Greece, though certain legends seem to point to it.

⁴ P. 92.

⁵ i. e. the semi-divine, semi-human sacrificial animal; the term was coined by Robertson Smith. Farnell, pp. 93 sq., cites several examples of ritual stories in Greece, in which animals were substituted for human victims, and explains these as probably arising from the deceptive appearance of many sacrifices where the victim was treated as human. Thus the legend of Athamas and Zeus Laphystius (see Hdt. VII, 197) illustrated the double view of human sacrifice, the confusion between human and animal offerings. This same blend characterized the Diipolia.

Our knowledge of the whole subject of totemism in Greece is still too meager for us authoritatively to explain all the details in the ritual of the buphonia. All we can say with certainty is that this ritual was in some way connected with agrarian rites, and with probability that it had some form of totemism behind it. It seems to show that the early community which centered around the Acropolis believed it was mystically maintained by eating an ox as a sacrament, in which ox, god and worshippers were akin. Slowly the special deity of an agricultural ox-clan grew to become the god of the State.

The first act in the drama of the Diipolia, then, was the buphonia or slaying of the ox, which took place at the altar of Zeus Polieus on the Acropolis. The second act was the ceremonial trial of the axe, which was enacted at the Prytaneum; and here also in all probability occurred the third act—the common sacrificial meal. It was doubtless at this feast that the silver drinking cup (*καρχήστιον ἀργυροῦν*) of Zeus Polieus, mentioned in inscriptions as among the treasures kept in the Parthenon, was used.¹ This brings us to a discussion of the Prytaneum and the trials of animals and inanimate things held there all through classical antiquity; and it will be our task to see if there is any truth in the tradition handed down by Pausanias that these legal processes had their origin in the trial of the axe used by the first ox-slayer.

The Prytaneum, as is well known, was simply the Hôtel de Ville of Athens as of every Greek town.² In it was the common hearth of the city,³ which represented the unity and vitality of the community. From its perpetual fire (*πῦρ δασβεστον*),⁴ colonists carried sparks to their new homes as a symbol of fealty⁵ and here in early times the chieftain or *πρύτανες* probably dwelt. In the synoecism of Theseus the prytanea of the separate communities of Attica were joined in a central one at Athens as a

¹ C. I. A. I, 154, l. 7: II, 649; 652; 660; for other sacrificial utensils see C. I. G. 140, 141, 150: etc.

² On the Prytanea in general, see Hagemann, *De Graecorum prytaneis, Vratislaviae*, 1881; Frazer, *Journ. Philol. XIV* (1885), pp. 145 sq.

³ Aristotle, *Polit. VI*, 8 p. 1322 b 28; *Plut. Quaest. conviv. VI*, 8. 1; *Pollux*, I, 7 and IX, 40; C. I. A. II, 467, l. 6; etc.

⁴ Cf. Aristotle, l. c.; C. I. A., l. c.; and *Plut. Numa* 9.

⁵ *Schol. on Aristides*, III, p. 48: *Etym. Magn.* p. 694, s. v. *πρύτανεῖα*.

sign of their union.¹ It was here that the images of Eirene and Hestia stood;² foreign ambassadors, famous citizens, strangers and athletes were entertained here,³ and in the same building the laws of Solon were displayed,⁴ and before Draco's day the archon eponymus used it as a dwelling.⁵ The site of the Prytaneum, and so of the court under discussion, is not definitely settled. It is generally supposed that in the lapse of centuries several buildings bore the name.

Many believe the original Prytaneum of the royal period must have been on the Acropolis. Certainly in the time of Pausanias it was near the Agraulium on the north slope of the Acropolis, a little to the east.⁶ In recent years Ernst Curtius has propounded a theory that the earliest Prytaneum, containing the hearth of Athens, was in the King's palace on the Acropolis which was the earliest center of public life, where the King sacrificed and the people assembled.⁷ Though Hestia always

¹ Thucyd. 2. 15; cf. Plut. Theseus, 24.

² Paus. I. 18. 3; cf. Pseudo-Plut. Vit. X Orat. p. 847 D.

³ Aristoph. Acharn. 124 sq.; Equites 709 (and Schol. on 167); Demosth. 7. 20; Poll. IX, 40; cf. Plato, Apol. 36. The stewards of the Panathenaic games had meals here during the festival; Aristotle, Constit. of Athens, 62. 2.

⁴ The so-called *άφορες*: Plut. Solon 25; Paus. I. 18. 3; Harpocrat. s. v. *άφοροι*; the *άφορες* and *κύρβεις*, Poll. VIII, 128.

⁵ Arist. Const. 3. 5.

⁶ I. 18. 3; cf. Judeich, Rhein. Mus. XLVII, 55. From the words of Paus. § 4—*ἐντρεῖον* (i. e. from the Prytaneum) *ἰοῦσιν ἐς τὰ κάτω τῆς πόλεως*—we infer it was near the top of the rock; cf. Gerhard, Phil. IV, 382; Bursian, Geogr. v. Griech. I, 295; Petersen, Arch. Ztg. X, 412; Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, I, 221 sq.; Harrison, Anc. Athens, 165-8. Bötticher believed he had found remnants of it between the churches of Hagios Soter and Hagios Simeon, just behind Hagios Nicolaos: Philol. Suppl. Bd. III (1867), 359 sq. For this position see Curtius, Topogr. Karte VI, at end of his Stadtgesch.; and Hitzig-Blümner, Paus. I. Tafel 2. But Milchhöfer, Baum. Denkmäler, art. Athen, I. 172, says no remnants are to be found. The street of the Tripods began at the Prytaneum; Paus. I. 20. 1.

⁷ Cf. Poll. IX, 40. For the theory of Curtius, see Stadtgeschichte, (Berlin 1891), pp. 51, 60, 224-5, 302: cf. Attische Studien (1863-4) II, 62, 65. His views have been accepted by Schöll, in Hermes VI (1872), p. 19 (cf. Jen. Litteraturzg. (1875), p. 690); Hagemann, p. 22 sq. and Marindin (Smith's Dict. of Antiq.⁸ 2, p. 514).

kept her original seat on the Acropolis,¹ as the city grew, her hearth was transferred to the old agora which he assumes was south of the Acropolis.² Here a new hearth and palace³—inseparable from the Prytaneum—arose as representative of the older ones and thereafter the King came down and treated with his people there.⁴ Nearby stood the Bucoleum, which at first was a sort of dairy and royal slaughter-house, but later the residence of the King-archon, where, down to the fourth century B. C., during the festival of the Anthesteria, the ceremonial marriage of his wife to Dionysus took place.⁵ Still later, as the space north of the Acropolis and east of the Cerameicus began to be used—a change already noticeable in the Peisistratid era—the hearth and Prytaneum were transferred to the north slope of the Acropolis where Pausanias saw them. Curtius believes the change took place in Macedonian times and under the initiative of Demetrius Phalereus toward the end of the fourth century B. C.⁶ As this part of the city was originally a suburb, he believes the Prytaneum could not have stood there in early days. The new one in comparison with the old one in the agora was a magnificent building.⁷ The older one was so eclipsed by the newer that eventually only certain judicial functions, the court under discussion, were carried on in its vicinity. Curtius

¹ C. I. A. III, 316, 317.

² Here he follows Thucyd. II, 15: this was the region of Kydathenaion, where the nobles dwelt; cf. Hesychius, s. v. Κυδαθηναῖος; etc.

³ βασιλεῖον; cf. Poll. VIII, 111.

⁴ Just so Numa built his regia at the foot of the Palatine on the edge of the Forum; cf. Servius, Verg. Aen. 8, 363.

⁵ Arist. Const. 3. 5. Bekk. Anecd. gr. 449, 19-21, says the Bucoleum and Prytaneum were together; cf. Suidas, s. v. ἀρχῶν. Poll. VIII, 111 says the palace and Bucoleum were together. Also the Διμοῦ τεδῖον was in the neighborhood: Zenob. 4. 93; cf. Bekk. 278, 4; 293, 32 and 296, 14; Phot. s. v. τεδία; Diogenianus, VI, 13; Hesych. s. v. Διμοῦ τεδῖον. Perhaps the sacred ploughing (*βουλύγιος*, sc. ἀρότος) mentioned by Plut. Coniug. Praecept. 42, cf. Hesych. s. v. *βουλύγης*, Philo, 2. 6. 30, took place near the Bucoleum; cf. Bötticher, l. c. p. 316.

⁶ He was governor of Athens 317-311 B. C., and was driven from the city in 306 B. C.

⁷ οἶκος μέγας (Schol. Thucyd. 2. 14): the old one was called οἰκίσκος (Schol. Aristoph. Equit. 167). The new one was also called Πρυτανικόν: C. I. A. II, 390, l. 20; 391; 394; 417; etc.

believes they never took place in the building mentioned by Pausanias.¹

The arguments of Curtius have been vigorously opposed.² Thus Poland places the Prytaneum in the temenos of Dionysus *ἐν λίμναις*, where Aristotle places the Bucoleum, in which the marriage already mentioned was celebrated.³ Curtius had placed this enclosure east of the old agora, i. e. south of the eastern end of the Acropolis.⁴ Dörpfeld has given strong reasons for locating it south of the Areopagus, i. e. southwest of the Acropolis.⁵ Poland, therefore, places the older of the two Prytanea, for with Curtius he assumes there were two, in that region.⁶ Lastly, Lipsius believes the court of the Prytaneum must always have been in the agora.⁷ Though the question cannot be settled and though the arguments of both Curtius and Poland seem plausible, there is no real evidence that the Prytaneum after the royal period ever stood anywhere else than on the northern slope of the Acropolis, where Pausanias saw it.⁸

¹ We get no help in solving the problem from Pausanias whose description of the murder courts (1. 28. 5-8. 11) seems to be only an antiquarian excursus, introduced into his narrative on mentioning the Areopagus. Such courts would be unimportant for travellers and they were widely separated, from the Areopagus to the Piraeus: see Schubart, *Jahrb. f. Philol.* XCVII, 825 sq.; Wachsmuth, *op. cit.* 1. 132 (cf. *Rhein. Mus.* XXIV, 36); Hagemann, p. 28, n. 46. However, Curtius, p. 289, believes Pausanias' account is topographical and that Roman travellers would be interested in these courts as they honored Athens as the cradle of their legal system (cf. Aelian, *Var. Hist.* VIII, 38).

² e. g. by Bursian, *de foro Athen.* 13; Lolling, *Hellen. Landeskunde u. Topogr.* (Müller's *Handbuch*, III, p. 320, n. 3), and others named in the text.

³ *Griech. Stud.* H. Lipsius *dargbr.* (1894), p. 85.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 61, fig. 13; cf. O. Müller, *Kleine Schriften*, II, 156, who placed it beneath the east end of the Acropolis, and Bötticher, *l. c.*, to the north.

⁵ *Athen. Mitt.* XVII, 439; XIX, 143.

⁶ Dörpfeld, *Ath. Mitt.* XX, 185, also assumes two, the one mentioned by Pausanias being of Roman origin, the other, southwest of the Acropolis; cf. also Maas, *de Lenaeo et Delphinio*, Greifswald, 1891, p. 7.

⁷ *Das Attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* [based on Meier-Schömann's *Der Attische Prozess*] (1881-6), I (1905), 58.

⁸ See Frazer, *Pausanias*, II, p. 172; cf. Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, 1. 46; for discussion of location see Hitzig-Blümner, *Pausanias*, I (1896), 1, 1. pp. 221-212; cf. p. 316.

One of the important features of the Prytaneum was the curious murder process held in its immediate neighborhood. Many Greek writers and inscriptions mention these trials, which appear to have comprehended three kinds of cases. In the first place, if a murderer was unknown or could not be found, he was nevertheless tried; also lifeless things, such as stones, beams, pieces of iron, etc., which had caused the death of a man by falling upon him, were tried here, as well as animals which had similarly been the cause of death.

For the first case Aristotle says tersely: "Whenever [the King-archon] does not know the one who did the deed, suit is brought against the doer".¹ Plato, whose striking precepts for his ideal laws were largely taken from existing Athenian laws,² gives the procedure more fully: "If a man is found dead, and his murderer be unknown, and after a diligent search cannot be detected, there shall be the same proclamation as in the previous cases, and the same interdict on the murderer; and they shall proceed against him and announce in the agora, that he who has slain such and such a person and has been convicted of murder, shall not set his foot in the temples, nor at all in the country of the murdered man, and if he appears and is discovered, he shall die and be cast forth unburied beyond the border".³

The second case is given by Demosthenes in his speech against Aristocrates in these words: "If a stone or a piece of wood or iron or anything similar falls and strikes a man, and the person who threw the thing is unknown, but the thing which killed the man is known and in the hands of the judges, it is tried at the Prytaneum".⁴ He goes on to argue that if it

¹ Constitution of Athens, 57. 4: *ὅταν δὲ μὴ εἴδῃ τὸν ποιήσαντα, τῷ δράσαντι λαγχάνει.* Here Mommsen, Feste, p. 519, n. 7, wrongly makes *δράσαντι* neuter, referring to the thing causing the death: thus he would do away with the first case entirely, whose existence is proved by several writers. *δὲ δράσας* regularly means "culprit": cf. Plato, Laws, IX, 874 B; Soph. Trachin. 1108; etc.

² Lipsius, op. cit. p. 131.

³ Laws, IX, 874 A (Jowett): cf. Pollux, VIII, 120, who states the law clearly.

⁴ 23. 76 (followed by Harpocrat, s. v. *ἐπὶ Πρυτανεῖ*; and epitomized by Suidas, Photius, etc. s. v. *ἐπὶ Πρυτανεῖ*): cf. Etymol. Magn. 362. 55; Bekk. 311, 15; Aeschines, 3. 244; Paus. 1. 28. 10; Aristotle, Const. 57. 4; Poll. VIII, 120.

is not right that inanimate and senseless things (*τῶν ἀψύχων καὶ μὴ μετεχόντων τοῦ φρονεῖν*), when under such a charge, should be left untried, it is surely impious that a man who is possibly innocent, but who, even if guilty, is at all events a human being, should be adjudged without a hearing and be given over to his accusers. Plato, who gives the law in full, exempts from its operation thunderbolts or "other fatal darts from the gods", and makes no distinction between men falling upon the thing or the thing falling upon them.¹

Of the trial of animals we know but little. The fact that they took place is attested by Aristotle² and especially Plato, who says: "And if a beast of burden or other animal cause the death of anyone, except in case of anything of that kind happening in the public contests, the kinsmen of the deceased shall prosecute the slayer for murder, and the wardens of the country, such, and so many as the kinsmen appoint, shall try the cause, and let the beast, when condemned, be slain by them and cast beyond the borders".³

In order to understand the issues raised by cases of this kind, we must keep in mind the Greek view of homicide. Manifestly the second case (and probably the third) was merely an amplification of the first; if the human murderer could not be found, the thing or animal that had been the agent in the slaying, if it could be found, had to be tried. For the idea was that, in case of a murder, not only a crime had been committed, but also a pollution had been caused in the community and some person or thing was to blame and must be punished to rid the state of defilement. A good idea of the Greek view that one or other was responsible is afforded by the subject-matter of Antiphon's Second Tetralogy. A boy was killed by running in the way of a javelin hurled by a youth who was practicing javelin-throwing in the gymnasium. The boy's father immediately accused the youth of accidental homicide. The question to be decided was, who was to blame? Evidently it was the boy, the youth or the javelin. If either of the first two, the case would be referred to the court of the Palladium, where cases of unpremeditated homicide were tried: if the javelin, it would be assigned to the

¹ Laws IX, 873 E-874 A.

² Constit. 57. 4.

³ Laws, IX 873 E (Jowett).

Prytaneum. In the actual case, however, it was only a question of living agents, and the boy's father haled the youth before the Palladium. The judges had nothing to do with the question of how far either youth or boy was morally to blame; they only had to decide who was the cause of death and the existing laws fixed the penalty. Nor must we think there was any lack of seriousness in the Greek view-point. We only have to remember that Pericles and Protagoras are said to have spent a whole day arguing just such a question.¹

As to how these trials were conducted we have but little information. We know that like all other murder trials at Athens they took place in the open air, so that, as Antiphon says, the judges might not sit under the same roof with one accused of impiety.² From a hint in the passage already quoted from Plato, in reference to the trials of unknown murderers, we can infer that the proceedings at the Prytaneum were the same as those in all the other Athenian homicide courts. This procedure we know from statements in various writers, especially from the orators. Thus the indictment (*γραφὴ φόνου*) was laid by the relatives of the victim within the usual degree of cousins' children inclusive.³ For the nearest of kin was bound by religious sanction from the earliest times to avenge blood guilt. The judicial summons (*πρόσκλησις*),⁴ that the murderer appear before the King-archon⁵ and answer the charges, was made by the kinsman before witnesses. The writ was not made against any suspect by name in the case of un-

¹ Plut. Pericles, 36.

² V. 11: cf. Aristotle, Const. 57. 4. The homicide cases were tried *ἐν Παλλαδίῳ*, *ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ*, etc.; cf. Aristot. 57. 3; Demosth. 23, 71, 74, 76. Pausanias, though using *ἐπὶ* in the other cases, says *τὸ δὲ ἐν Πρυτανεῖ*, 1. 28. 10; but probably this is without significance. Similarly among the ancient Germans, courts were in the open air: cf. Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer (ed. Heusler and Hübner, 1899), pp. 793 sq.

³ Demosth. 47. 72; law, 43, 57; C. I. A. I, 61, 1. 17. Of course in the first case there could be no arrest (*ἀπαγωγὴ*), which only happened when the man was caught in the act (*ἐπὶ αὐτοφέρῳ*): cf. Antiphon, V, 9; Andoc. 1. 88; Demosth. 24. 113.

⁴ Demosth. 43. 15; Lysias, 104, 13; Aristoph. Vespa, 1041; cf. Plato, Laws VIII, 846 B, and IX, 855 D.

⁵ Arist. Constit. 57. 3.

known murderers, but ran generally "against those who had done and slain".¹ The prosecutor uttered at the funeral the solemn denunciation, technically called *πρόρρησις*,² warning the murderer to keep away from all public places, sanctuaries, assemblies, etc.³ This interdict was repeated by the King-archon in the agora.⁴ It was felt to be necessary to keep the people free of contagion, and temples and altars would have become unclean from the murderer's presence; and these were the very places where men were wont to come to be purified. This pollution continued until the manslayer had expiated his crime by proper ceremonies.⁵ If the man ever returned and was seen walking in the public places, the prosecutor could carry him off to prison where he would remain until tried again.⁶ He was safe as long as he kept away, and whoever killed him under those conditions was himself treated as a murderer.⁷ Three successive investigations in three succes-

¹ Demosth. 47, 69; cf. Arist. Constit. 57, 4.

² Antiphon, V, 88; VI, 6; Demosth. 47, 69; Plato, Laws, IX, 871 C, 873 A, etc. Those who met a violent death at Athens were interred with peculiar formalities. We learn from several writers, (Demosth. *ibid.*, Eurip. *Troad.* 1148, *Harpocration*, s. v. *ἴπεργκεῖν δόρυ*) that, to symbolize the pursuit of the murderer, the accuser carried a spear in front of the procession, and, after having made the proclamation at the tomb, stuck it upright on the grave and watched it for three days.

³ Demosth. 20, 158; law, 23, 37; Antiph. V, 10; cf. Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 236, where the denunciation of the murderer of Laius put into the mouth of Oedipus is borrowed from Attic law. Plato, Laws, IX, 871 A, says if the kindred fail to prosecute they also become involved in pollution and become hateful to the gods.

⁴ Arist. *I. c.*; Bekk. 310, 6-9; Plato, Laws, IX, 874 A. Plato in this passage says the *πρόρρησις* is given in the case of unknown murderers after conviction.

⁵ Cf. Aeschyl. *Eumen.* 230, where the chorus of Furies say they will pursue Orestes to death; also *ibid.* 421-3, where they say they will hound him to "where to rejoice not is the appointed doom".

⁶ Demosth. 23, 80; law, 23, 28; cf. Plato, Laws, IX, 865, who mentions an "ancient tale" that the murdered man is angry at his slayer, and, when he sees him walking in his accustomed haunts, becomes disordered and this disorder is communicated to the slayer. Therefore the homicide must stay away from the land of his victim for one year or be punished.

⁷ Demosth. 23, 37.

sive months were made by the King-archon,¹ and the case was tried on the last three days of the fourth.²

Such in brief, then, was the procedure in all murder trials at Athens. In the cases at the Prytaneum, however, though the culprits were solemnly heard and condemned, there seems, as Cauer has shown,³ to have been no proper decision ($\deltaιαγνώναι$), owing to the fact that such trials were more religious than judicial in character, like the *deodand* trials in England. We know that the tokens of the slaying, as well as animals, if found guilty, were cast beyond the borders, to free the land from pollution.⁴

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

¹ Antiph. VI, 42.

² Poll. VIII, 117; cf. Antiph. 1. c., who says the last three months of the Attic year were excluded for trying homicide cases because the archon was not allowed to hand them over to his successor.

³ Verhandl. d. 40. Philol.-Versamml. zu Görlitz, 110.

⁴ Aeschines 3. 244; Poll. VIII, 120; Paus. 6. 11. 6 (= the sea at Thasos, i. e. the border); Harpocrat.; etc. Plato, Laws IX, 874 A, also adds that the unknown murderer, if later found, "shall die and be cast forth unburied beyond the border".

(*To be continued*)

III.—RELIGIOUS BURLESQUE IN ARISTOPHANES AND ELSEWHERE.

The student of Aristophanes is confronted with at least two questions raised by the poet's treatment of the gods. How could one who attacked Socrates and Euripides for their views about the gods permit himself to portray the divinities in such ridiculous and despicable guise? And how was it that if he could allow himself such inconsistency, the Athenian people did not bring him to trial for impiety, as they did many another for words perhaps less compromising?

It is the purpose of this paper to present certain considerations, which, if they do not solve the problem, do, I think, shed some light upon it. I have no space to refer to the passages in which the gods are burlesqued,—they are fairly familiar;¹ it is enough to state that in the extant plays most of the deities except Apollo and Athena are burlesqued, and we have no assurance that these two escaped in the thirty or so plays that have perished. In general, too, religious burlesque is not characteristic of the choral passages,² some of which, indeed, have the force and fervor of religious hymns; and all the paraphernalia of religion, except the gods themselves, escape with a rather innocuous type of satire, if satire it can be called at all.

Much has been said of what is called the "impiety" of Aristophanes. Some, like Behaghel³ and Boettiger,⁴ deny its existence and maintain that the poet was attacking only superstition. To say nothing of the difficulty of distinguishing superstition and religion, Pascal's collection⁵ of references to what may fairly be called superstitions shows that they are

¹ The material is collected in Pascal, Dioniso: *Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane*, Catania, 1911, but little or no attempt is made to solve the problem posed by religious parody itself.

² Pascal, *op. cit.* 66 f.

³ Behaghel, *De vetere comoedia deos irridente*, 1856.

⁴ Boettiger, *Aristophanes impunitus deorum gentilium irrisor*, 1837.

⁵ Dioniso, chapter 10.

usually mentioned not with satiric intent,—indeed the poet is singularly lenient toward them,—but to give local or dramatic color.

Others, like Mahaffy,¹ Hild,² and Kock,³ emphasize the impiety of Aristophanes and ascribe his attacks on Socrates and Euripides to motives of policy and the desire to please a thoroughly sceptical and irreligious public. Still others concede that the poet was impious but attempt in various ways to minimize the effect of his ridicule. Ridicule was not so keenly felt by the Athenian as by the modern man⁴; the gods are fond of a joke,⁵ even on themselves; perhaps they even relish a bit of disrespect⁶; the Ionian was on very easy terms with his gods; nothing popularizes like genial ridicule.⁷

Leaving aside for the present the troublesome and disputed question of what the Athenian meant by *doébeta* and how far one might go in words if his acts conformed to public ritual, it has become clear to me that only a superficial answer to the problem of religious burlesque can be reached unless we go deeper and consider the poet not merely in himself but in connection with popular comedy. We then see that burlesque of deity is not confined to Ionians and that it is a very early, if not an essential, element in Greek comedy. It was almost as much a characteristic of comedy as was ridicule of human individuals. The fragments of the Taxiarchs of Eupolis, in which the soft and effeminate Dionysus visits the lower world to learn the art of warfare from a famous dead general,⁸ suggest our poet's portrayal of the same deity, developing blisters in each most tender spot as he tries to work his passage across the Stygian lake in Gaffer Charon's boat. Cratinus in his Dionysalexandros⁹ does no better by him than did Aristophanes in the Empousa scene of the Frogs. Throughout Attic comedy

¹ History of Classical Greek Literature I, 465.

² Aristophanes impietatis reus, 92 and 131; cf. 3.

³ Aristophanes und die Götter des Volksglaubens; Jahrb. für kl. Phil. Suppl. Bd. III, 1857, 67–109.

⁴ Thirlwall, History of Greece, III, 83.

⁵ Wright, Greek Literature, 299, quoting Plato, Crat. 406 C. Deschanel, Études sur Aristophane, 305.

⁶ Deschanel, 311 f.

⁷ G. Lowes Dickinson, The Greek View of Life, 46.

⁸ Schol. on Aristoph. Pax, 347.

the character of Dionysus was evidently fixed and conventional as gluttonous, vainglorious, and lecherous, and Aristophanes, when he drew his comic picture, was simply following the conventional line of Attic comedy, possibly with somewhat unusual verve and daring.

But such portrayal of deity was not exclusively Attic, nor even Ionic. In Dorian Syracuse, years before, when the germs of what afterwards became comedy were in process of development, Epicharmus produced burlesques on Homer and Hesiod. In the "Marriage of Hebe", Zeus is¹ a gluttonous obese Gargantua, Athena a street musician who makes Castor and Pollux dance an obscene figure to her flute; Hephaestus is the harlequin of the troupe, and the Muses are transformed to fish-wives. It is probable, indeed, that religious burlesque was more adapted to the free air of Attica than to any Doric community, even a Sicilian city. Certainly the Ionian was very fond of it, even outside of comedy. In Homer there are the battles of the gods, and the picture of Ares and Aphrodite in the lay of Demodocus. In these and other Homeric pictures the significant thing is not so much the immorality of the deities,—immoral conduct on the part of the gods characterizes most mythologies,—but the tone of banter with which their failings are set forth. Then, too, the satyr play parodied the myths of gods and heroes, and must have been a type of burlesque. The Plautine Amphitryo, though not strictly a native product, goes to show that Rome appreciated mythological travesty. I have wondered if the Hebrew ever indulged in it: If he did, the traces have been singularly well edited out of our texts. Crudities are left, but the tone is everywhere serious. The ass, for example, is a *märchen* motif, which easily lends itself to humorous treatment,² as in the mediaeval Christmas play, but the story of Balaam's ass is remarkably free from the humorous tone. In another distinctly *märchen*-like motif, that of the Samson story, there is an unmistakable dash of humor, but if the hero was originally a divine figure, his divinity has been thoroughly obscured, and it is a very human Samson who fritters away his God-given strength in puerile acts and showy feats of daring.

¹ Deschanel, *op. cit.* 311.

² W. Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie, Mythus und Religion*, III, 111 f.

In mediaeval Christianity there is, of course, a very different tale to tell. It is unnecessary to rehearse the steps by which tragedy and comedy were introduced into the liturgy of the church for educational purposes, at first in the church edifice and in Latin, but, with the growth of their popularity, outside the church also and in the vernacular. Detail of a more or less trivial character, added to the scriptural account, afforded an entrance to comedy and certain characters came to be relied upon to play the clown and furnish fun for the crowd. When the mysteries fell into the hands of the guilds, though still composed by the ecclesiastics, the comic element certainly lost nothing. Noah's refractory wife in the Chester pageant of the Deluge, who, when finally constrained to leave her gossips and enter the ark, answers her good husband's welcome with a resounding slap, "et victa dat alapam"; and Gill the ingenious wife of Mac, the sheep-stealer in the Wakefield Second Shepherd's play, illustrate the milder type of humor, humor applied to characters which have little or nothing to do with the Biblical narrative itself. But the burlesque easily and early laid hold upon characters of more importance. The devil is especially burlesqued and humiliated. Nor do saints and apostles escape.¹ It is curious, when we remember that the plays took their rise in that great church which emphasizes the person and authority of Peter, that the denying apostle is made an especially comic figure. Much of the humor of the mediaeval ecclesiastical play collects around him. By the stupid fashion in which he gets himself tricked, he often becomes the human pendant to the figure of the stupid belabored devil. Why Peter was selected for this part is not clear. Dähnhardt² has tried to explain it by supposing that Paulicians and Bogomiles and other sects of Oriental origin, in their one-sided emphasis of Paul, saw only a false apostle in Peter, the representative of strict Judaism. But, as Wundt³ points out, the transformation of Peter is in a way prepared for by certain features in the gospel narratives themselves. Then, too, in the mediaeval mystery play, developed, as it was, under the most orthodox influences, there can scarcely be any serious intrusion of the hated and heretical Paulician doctrines. I am inclined to

¹ Wundt, op. cit. III, 129 f.

² *Natursagen*, I, 205.

³ op. cit. III, 130⁴.

attribute the comic preëminence of Peter precisely to his high position in the traditions of the church. For the burlesque often extends to the persons of the Trinity. In the contests between God and the devil, it is sometimes disputed which of the two takes the better care of what he has created, whether the devil can destroy God's work, or whether his attempts to do so can be frustrated by the superior trickery of God.¹ Here the joking extends to the person of God himself; that of the virgin is involved in the Coventry "Trial of Joseph and Mary". A very curious passage is found in the miracle of the child given to the devil.² A woman had given her child to the devil but the virgin Mary appears before God and pleads with him to cancel the bargain. The devils present their side of the case but God yields to Mary on the curious ground that the child's father had not been consulted and the bargain was therefore void. The devils are very angry and one of them with more vigor than respect says: We are fools to have trusted in God's justice. He has always been our enemy. He doesn't dare do anything against his mother's desire; if he did anything contrary to her wishes, he'd get a beating for his pains:

Si lui faisait riens de contraire
Il serait batuz au retour.

I heard recently a series of scripture stories, purporting to come from the mouth of an aged negro mammy, who got them from Roman Catholic missionaries in Northern Africa. Burlesque of Peter was prominent, but banter of God was even more frequent. "De Lord came loping down de big road." "One Sunday de Lord was feeling rambunctious, for it was his day." The Lord exhibits a childish glee at his successive acts of creation. "Won't de archangels be surprised!", he exclaims.

Contemporary with this burlesque of sacred characters, there was an even more extraordinary and unrestrained burlesque of ecclesiastical rites. Even in the churches and under the especial patronage of the clergy, the feast of fools, the feast of the ass, the feast of the innocents, enjoyed great popularity. In the feast of fools, for example, a burlesque clergy attended the

¹ Wundt, *op. cit.* III, 129 f.

² This, to which my attention was directed by the kindness of my colleague, Professor Oscar Kuhns, is one of forty miracles of Our Lady, found in a Paris manuscript.

church in disguises and masquerade dresses and burlesqued the service. "On entering the choir, the participants danced and sang licentious songs. The deacons and sub-deacons ate black puddings and sausages on the altar while the priest was celebrating [mass], others played cards or dice under his eyes, and still others threw bits of old leather into the censer to raise a disagreeable smell. After the mass was ended the people broke out into all sorts of riotous behavior in the church, leaping, dancing, and exhibiting themselves in lewd postures", etc.¹

Such conduct illustrates and perhaps is partly to be explained by the practice of ritual license, of which Frazer² quotes numerous examples. Some have invoked ritual license to explain the burlesque of the gods in Aristophanes.³ There can be no doubt that one characteristic of the Dionysiac festival was license of this ritual sort, which stripped the individual of the protection which at other times the law afforded him against vilification and slander. No spectator was safe from the comedian's coarse jokes and very likely the rough handling of human subjects had some influence on the poet's treatment of the divine. Perhaps no religion more than the Greek insisted on the essential affinity and close relationship of god and man. The two are of like nature and, to some extent, the same treatment will do for both. And yet, however much burlesque of god and man may have been intertwined and may have influenced each other, I am inclined to think that each has a fairly distinct origin and motive. The vilification or abuse of man was apotropaic or avertive. It was used to counteract evil influences, especially the dreaded evil eye, and was employed very largely at times of special happiness and exaltation,—marriage, triumph, vintage, harvest, initiation into the mysteries,—which were considered seasons of especial liability to malign influences. This is complicated by admixture with elements of phallus cult, based on the worship or the magical use of the powers of fertility, but eventuating in rank obscenity, which was then itself supposed to exercise beneficial and

¹ Thomas Wright, *History of Caricature and Grotesque in Literature and Art*, 210.

² *Spirits of the Corn and the Wild*, II, 62 and 66; *The Scapegoat*, 127, 131, 148, 225 ff; *Balder the Beautiful*, I, 135 and 339; etc.

³ e. g. *Forman, Clouds*, 43.

protective power. But to explain the element of burlesque of deity, I think we must extend our search a little further yet.

Such burlesque, we have seen, is not peculiar to Aristophanes, nor to the Ionian. Just as little is it peculiar to the Greek. The tendency thereto is perhaps as widespread as the human race. Speaking of Jeremy Taylor, Taine remarks¹ that familiarity and recklessness in handling the gods are marks of true faith,—a faith so sure of itself that it cannot and will not be tied down. We have all heard pious clergymen joke on religious matters and make racy references to the Deity, and the free language of the popular revivalist does not necessarily mean that he is impious and insincere. As Taine goes on to say, Luther himself shocks us by his “rude words, the bursts of laughter which shook his mighty paunch, his workaday rages, his plain and free speaking, the audacious familiarity with which he treats Christ and the Deity”.²

Lucretius maintained that religion is the offspring of fear: in a sense, that is probably true, but it is equally true that religion tends to eliminate the fear which gave it birth. G. Lowes Dickinson,³ speaking of the Greek religion particularly, remarks that religion tends to put a man into harmony with the world about him and at ease with the invisible powers. Fowler⁴ points out that the Romans attained the *pax deorum* by their characteristic conception of religion as a *Rechts-verkehr* between God and man. Religion finds ways to placate the unseen powers, and, at the very worst gives man something to occupy his attention in seasons of stress,—some ritual act to perform, so that he need not stand in helpless inaction and despair. Then, too, he tends to relegate harmful powers to demons, while he considers the gods bright and glorious forms, which attract his imagination and receive from him a periodic worship, but are incapable of doing him any harm. But he jests at what he no longer fears, and the jesting implies no disrespect. Wundt thinks that the earliest of all changes of motif, one found everywhere and antedating the origin of the drama proper, is the transition from the serious to the burlesque,⁵ due,

¹ History of English Literature, translated by Van Laun, I, 467.

² ibid.

³ The Greek View of Life, 2-9.

⁴ The Religious Experience of the Roman People, 169 f.

⁵ op. cit. I, 511. cf. Archiv für Religionswissenschaft XI, 222.

partly at least, to the contrast demanded by the tension of feeling which the serious act of worship has awakened. The primitive beast-tale passes from a serious account of some animal that is deemed the ancestor or helper of the clan and becomes a jest tale,¹ depicting the animal in some comic guise or situation or act, like those of Brer Rabbit in the Uncle Remus stories. Whatever its psychological origin, a tendency to the comic is characteristic of the earlier stages of mythology and perhaps runs through all the history of religion.

In the welter of recent polemic regarding the origin of drama, it is dangerous to speak with too much assurance, but it does seem fairly clear that both tragedy and comedy go back to the dance, which anthropological investigation has shown to be an extremely important element in primitive religion. It is often stated that the dancer impersonates demon or animal by bearing its likeness or wearing its mask. Probably, however, it is not mere impersonation but the man who wears the demon's mask is for the time being that demon's self² and possesses its powers so that he can make rain, cause the crops to grow, and otherwise influence the course of nature. The dance is a piece of imitative magic, the dancer imitates the supposed acts of the demon in order to perform its supposed functions. This immediate imitation of the doings of demons, and, later, of divinities, Wundt calls the 'mythological mime',³ the first step toward drama. He traces it through the 'religious mime', where not only impersonal demons but more personal deities are imitated and not only isolated events but a life history, say of a year demon, is portrayed.⁴ The mime of a god's life and sorrows was already on the verge of tragedy⁵ and in Greece the transition from the mythological to the religious mime seems to have been made in the mysteries,⁶ which were originally closely connected with magic but almost certainly became a portrayal of the sorrows, death, and ultimate triumph over death of the deity which was developing from the year demon.

Now it is precisely in this solemn type of cult act that we find distinct elements of burlesque and comedy. These come with the inevitable weakening of the magical idea, the rise of

¹ Wundt, op. cit. III, 129.

² Wundt, op. cit. I, 413.

³ op. cit. I, 477.

⁴ op. cit. I, 472.

⁵ op. cit. I, 469.

⁶ op. cit. I, 476.

the doubt whether man after all is actually influencing the course of the seasons, carrying out Winter, bringing in Summer. The ridicule early takes the form of burlesquing sacred beasts. The monuments of early Mycenean worship show composite figures which have been thought to represent worshipers more or less fully disguised as beasts,—and such masquerades are common enough in primitive cult. Usually the disguise is a mere mask, worn to strengthen the suggestion that the worshiper is the actual embodiment of the beast ancestor or protector or demon. It was not worn for comic effect and would produce no such comic impression as a modern beast mask does. But suppose, with the weakening belief in the magical efficacy of the rite, you leave off the mask. You have broken the illusion, and to do that is one of the recognized means of producing comic effect.¹ At once a comic contrast is felt between the object imitated and the all too obvious human who is doing the imitating. Now, as Wundt points out,² the absence of mask is characteristic of the burlesque mime, which is perhaps the next step toward the development of comedy and certainly influenced comedy very greatly. Comedy itself Wundt derives, however, not directly from the burlesque mime, whose direct descendant is rather the puppet show of the wandering players, but from the religious mime from which tragedy only later developed.³

Comedy, then, is the earlier of the two to come into being and some intellectually well-endowed peoples never get beyond it in the development of the dramatic art.⁴ Of the two, comedy remained the longer true to its religious origin, in at least one respect. Both began with characters divine or demonic. Tragedy, as it introduced human figures upon the stage, bowed out the gods or reduced them to occasional appearances from the machine, or relegated them to a prologue. The satyr play with which each tragic trilogy closed, not only retained the old beast dance in the chorus of bestial satyrs, which were protected from humanization perhaps by the never-failing comedy of their half-goat forms,⁵ but showed its conservatism by

¹ Pascal, *Dioniso*, VII f.

² op. cit. I, 482 and 512.

³ op. cit. I, 511.

⁴ Wundt, op. cit. 517.

⁵ Wundt, op. cit. II, 286.

introducing divine or heroic characters, and, apparently, with a touch of burlesque. Comedy retained the gods longer, partly because there was no satyr play to which they could be relegated, and, of course, represented them in comic and burlesque guise.

It seems to me, then, quite futile to inquire why Aristophanes or any other individual burlesqued the gods. Burlesque was not a trait of any individual poet, but of an institution and had its roots in the very nature of the human mind. In their art forms, the Athenians tempered progress and innovation with a rather severe conservatism, as the curious, almost anomalous retention of the satyr play testifies. At the close of his stormy and embittered career, Euripides wrote his *Bacchae*, a play cast in the old broken mould of the life and death of the year demon, thus practically reverting to the framework of the religious mime. And so, while granting much to those who maintain that burlesque of the gods was tolerated because of the license of the comic festival, I incline to think we should go further and recognize that in adhering or reverting to an old principle consecrated by immemorial ritual this Athenian of the Athenians needed no toleration as one who had perpetrated some new or unheard of thing, but might fairly have boasted that he was true to his colors as a conservative in politics, art, and religion.

JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

IV.—ON THE DISPOSITION OF SPOIL IN THE HOMERIC POEMS.

The question as to precisely why Achilles yields to Agamemnon in Book I of the Iliad, and, while confident of his own superior prowess, allows his prize of valor to be taken from him by the king without even a show of resistance, has exercised commentators ancient and modern; and in particular the lines in which Achilles says to Agamemnon that he will not defend his rights by force in the matter of the woman, but that if Agamemnon dares to touch aught else that is his he will slay him, have been felt as a veritable stumbling-block. For it is precisely this act on the part of Agamemnon—the robbing of Achilles of his prize of valor—which cuts the young prince to the quick.

The answer to the main point is plain. Achilles yields because Athene has bidden him to yield; no man may disobey the express command of a god (see Roemer, *Homerische Aufsätze*, 177 ff.). We must remember that when the king says explicitly that in letting Chryseis go in the interest of the army at large, he means to reimburse himself by taking the prize of Achilles, the latter's hand goes at once to his sword-hilt to slay his foe then and there. In such an age a high-spirited prince would feel that such a direct personal affront could be wiped out only by the blood of the offender; and so Homer would have us conceive the scene. Then Athene intervenes, and bids Achilles desist. He must obey, and yield; but the yielding, with its apparent acknowledgment of his impotence, must have been hard indeed. For while to be robbed of the woman whom he had come to love as his wife was much—infinitely much, the thing that rankled most was the thought that Agamemnon dared to do this thing, and put this affront upon him in the presence of the assembled Greek host, as though he, Achilles, the peer in rank of any man among them, and in valor the best man of them all, were a man of no standing, an outlander, slave or outlaw, who had no rights that any man need respect (see IX. 647 ff.; XVI. 56 ff.).

The various scholia on the passage before us are of interest, and those too on IX. 367. In them the attempt is made to

distinguish between the *γέρας* and the other spoil which had fallen to the lot of Achilles (this taken by itself is perfectly right), but the untenable view is held that the *γέρας* was given by the king, and could therefore be recalled at will. Hence in the view of the scholiasts Achilles was in duty bound to yield in the matter of Briseis. Had Agamemnon gone further it would have been *ὑθρις*; as it was, he was within his rights.

The passage in Book I should be cited in its entirety (lines 298-303) :

χερσὶ μὲν οὐ τοι ἐγώ γε μαχήσομαι εἰνεκα κούρης
οὔτε σοὶ οὔτε τῷ ἄλλῳ; ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφέλεσθέ γε δόντες·
τῶν δ' ἄλλων, ἡ μοί ἐστι θοῇ παρὰ τηλί μελαίνη,
τῶν οὐκ ἀν τι φέροις ἀνελῶν ἀέκοντος ἐμεῖο·
εἰ δ' ἄγε μήν πείρησαι, ίνα γυνάσσῃ καὶ οἴδε·
αιψά τοι αἷμα κελαινὸν ἔρωήσει περὶ δονρί.

Surely Erhardt shows a complete failure to apprehend the meaning of these words, when he writes: " Mit andern Worten heiszt das doch: in dem was du wirklich verlangst werde ich dir nachgeben; aber hüte dich, sonst noch etwas zu verlangen ". This is completely to ignore the words *ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφέλεσθέ γε δόντες*, " Ye do but take from me what ye gave ", words which emphasize the distinction between the *γέρας* (the gift, as Achilles here puts it, given to him by the army as a prize of valor) and his own possessions. It is this last point that concerns us. In Book IX Achilles speaks of Briseis as having been given to him by Agamemnon, not by the army; and it is alleged that we have in this fact one of the many indications that Book IX is not an integral part of the Iliad, but a later addition.

My purpose in this paper is not to discuss anew this perplexing but fascinating problem, but merely to investigate the question of this last supposed contradiction. The matter itself may seem of slight importance, but it has a direct bearing upon the literary problem of problems—the right interpretation of the Iliad.

The passage which has suggested this discussion (I. 298 ff.) is unique in one respect. Only here is it said that it was the collective Greeks who robbed Achilles of his prize. In every other passage in which allusion is made to this act of *ὑθρις*, the wrong-

doing is attributed to the king and to him alone; and the expressions of hatred on the part of Achilles are directed against the king, not against the collective Greeks. Book XVI. 97 ff. is the only real exception, and that passage is by many regarded as spurious on quite independent grounds. But in its representation of Briseis as a prize given to Achilles by the army at large, not by the king, this passage is wholly in harmony with the bulk of the poem. It will be enough to cite the most significant parallels:

I. 162, γέρας | φέπι πολλὰ μόγησα, δόσαν δέ μοι νίες Ἀχαιῶν.
 I. 276, ἀλλ' ἔα ὡς οἱ πρώτα δόσαν γέρας νίες Ἀχαιῶν.
 I. 366 ff., φέρμεθ' ἐς Θήβην, ιερὴν πόλιν Ἡετίων,
 τὴν δὲ διεπράθομέν τε καὶ ἡγομένην ἐνθάδε πάντα.
 καὶ τὰ μὲν εὐ δάσσαντο μετὰ σφίσιν νίες Ἀχαιῶν,
 ἐκ δ' ἔλον Ἀτρετῆς Χρυσῆδα καλλιπάρησον.
 I. 392, κούρην Βρισῆος, τὴν μοι δόσαν νίες Ἀχαιῶν.
 XVI. 56 ff., κούρην, ἦν ἄρα μοι γέρας ἔξελον νίες Ἀχαιῶν.
 XVIII. 444, κούρην, ἦν ἄρα οἱ γέρας ἔξελον νίες Ἀχαιῶν.

These passages all have reference to the specific case of Briseis (or Chryseis), but the same view obtains in others in which the matter of the distribution of spoil is touched upon more generally:

I. 118, αὐτὰρ ἔμοι γέρας αὐτίχ' ἐτοιμάσατ'.
 I. 123 ff., πῶς γάρ τοι δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί;
 οὐδέ τί τον ἴδμεν ἔνημα κείμενα πολλά,
 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξεπράθομεν, τὰ δέδασται,
 λαοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐπέοικε παλίλλογα ταῦτ' ἐπαγείρειν.
 I. 135 f., ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί,
 ἀρσαντες κατὰ θυμόν, ὅπως ἀντάξιον ἔσται—.
 I. 163 ff., οὐ μὲν σοὶ ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας ὀππότ' Ἀχαιοί
 Τρώων ἐκπέρσωσ' ἐν ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον·
 ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλεῖον πολυάικος πολέμοιο
 χείρες ἔμαι διέποντο', ἀτὰρ ἦν ποτε δασμὸς ἵκηται
 σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μεῖζον, ἐγὼ δ' ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε
 ἔρχομ' ἔχων ἐπὶ νῆας, ἐπει κε κάμω πολεμίζων.

II. 225 ff., 'Ατρεδη, τέο δὴ αντ' ἐπιμέμφεαι ἡδὲ χατίεις;
πλεῖαί τοι χαλκοῦ κλισίαι, πολλαὶ δὲ γυναικες
εἰσὶν ἐνὶ κλισίης ἔξαίρετο, ἃς τοι 'Αχαιοὶ¹
τρωτίστη δίδομεν, εντ' ἀν πτολιεθροὶ ἐλωμεν.

II. 254 ff., τῷ νῦν 'Ατρεδη 'Αγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν,
ἥσαι ὄνειδίζων, ὅτι οἱ μάλα πολλὰ δίδοῦσιν
ῆρωες Δαναοί.

IX. 135 ff., (to be taken up later).

XI. 625, ('Εκαμήδη) τὴν ἄρετ' ἐκ Τενέδοιο γέρων, ὅτε πέρσεν
'Αχιλλεύς,
θυγατέρ' 'Αρσινόου μεγαλήτορος, ἣν οἱ 'Αχαιοὶ²
ἔξελον.

Od. VII. 9ff., (Εύρυμέδονσα)

τίνη ποτ' 'Απείρθεν νέες ἥγαγον ἀμφέλισσαι·
'Αλκινόψ δ' αὐτὴν γέρας ἔξελον, οὐνεκα πᾶσιν
Φαιήκεσσιν ἄνασσε, θεοῦ δ' ὡς δῆμος ἄκουεν.

Od. IX. 41ff., ἐκ πόλιος δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες
δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τις μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἵσης.

(This last line recurs in Od. IX. 549, and, with the substitution of δαιτρεύειν for δασσάμεθ', in Il. XI. 705. That passage, together with Il. IX. 135 ff., will be considered presently.)

In the light of this array of evidence it may well seem strange indeed that in two passages in Achilles' speech in Book IX he speaks as though Briseis had been given him not by the collective Greeks but by Agamemnon. The passages are:

IX. 330 ff., τάων ἐκ πασέων κειμήλια πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὰ
ἔξελόμην, καὶ πάντα φέρων 'Αγαμέμνονι δόσκον
'Ατρεδη· δ' ὁ δ' ὅπισθε μένων παρὰ νησὶ θοῆσιν
δεξάμενος διὰ παύρα δασάσκετο, πολλὰ δ' ἔχεσκεν.

IX. 367 ff., ἀξομαι, ἀσσ' ἔλαχόν γε· γέρας δέ μοι, ὃς περ ἔδωκεν,
αὐτὶς ἐφυβρίζων ἐλετο κρείων 'Αγαμέμνων
'Ατρεδης.

It would seem as if here the king, and he alone, was regarded as having the right to dispose of spoil, whether taken by himself or by another, and that in the disposition he might keep what he would, and give only what he pleased to the other chieftains. Here there seems at first sight to be a real discrepancy;—but

both these passages occur in the speech of an angry man with reference to the act of one whom he has come to hate with a perfect hatred. The scholiast on the latter of these two passages shows a due appreciation of this fact: *πάλιν δὲ τὸ κυμάζον πάθος εἴλκυσσεν τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα. δεινοποιῶν δὲ τὴν ὕβριν Ἀγαμέμνονος φῆσι τὸ ὕσπερ <ὅς τε scil. > ἔδωκεν, ἐκεὶ δὲ <i. e. in Book I> ἐπανιστὰς τὸ πλῆθος, “δόσαν δέ μοι τὸν Ἀχαιῶν”.*

On this ground alone we should be prepared to make allowances for the rhetoric of passion, and we should not hastily conclude that we are dealing with the work of another poet; but there is further evidence to be considered. These two passages do indeed stand alone with reference to the giving of Briseis to Achilles; they are by no means isolated in suggesting a disposition of spoil by an individual chieftain without apparent reference to the army at large. Attention should be called to the following parallels:

VIII. 287 ff. (Agamemnon is speaking to Teucer),

αὶ κέν μοι δώῃ Ζεὺς τ' αἰγύλοχος καὶ Ἀθήνη
 'Ιλίου ἔξαλαπάξαι ἐνκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,
 πρώτῳ τοι μετ' ἐμὲ πρεσβύτιον ἐν χερὶ θύρω,
 ἡ τρίποδ' ἡδὲ δύνω ἵππους αὐτοῖσιν δχεσφίν
 τὴ γυναιχ'.

IX. 128 ff. (= 270 ff., *mutatis mutandis*),

δώσω δ' ἐπτὰ γυναικας ἀμύμονα ἔργα ιδνίας,
 Λεσβίδας, ἄσ, ὅτε Λέσβον ἐνκτιμένην ἔλεν αὐτός,
 ἔξελόμην.

Here there is no mention of the army. Agamemnon has chosen for himself what he pleased, of booty taken by Achilles. (Contrast XI. 625 ff., and cf. II. 229 ff.)

IX. 667, 'Ιφις ἐνζωνος, τὴν οἱ πόρε δίος Ἀχιλλεὺς
 Σκύρον ἐλὰν αἴτειαν.

Here Achilles seems to have assumed control of the distribution of the spoil. There is no hint that the army at large had any voice in the matter. We should note, too, that his bestowal of Iphis upon Patroclus is closely parallel to the view which represents Agamemnon as giving Briseis to *him*.

X. 303 ff.; cf. 321 ff.; 392 f.

These passages need not be cited in full. They all have to do with Hector's offer to the one who will go as a spy to the Greek camp. He will give the man who dares this adventure the best chariot and the two best chariot horses in the Greek army (Dolon himself specifies those of Achilles, and Hector agrees). Hector therefore evidently regards himself as in a position to bestow spoil on whom he will.

XVI. 152 f., ἐν δὲ παρηρίγου ἀμύμονα Πήδασον ἵε,
τόν ρά ποτ' Ἡετίωνος ἐλὼν πόλιν ἡγαγ' Ἀχιλλεύς.

This is of course inconclusive, but at least there is no mention of the army. Quite similar is

IX. 188, τὴν ἄρετ' ἐξ ἐνάρων, πόλιν Ἡετίωνος δλέσσας.

Od. XIV. 229 ff., πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Τροίης ἐπιβήμεναι νέας Ἀχαιῶν
εἰνάκις ἀνδράσιν ἥρξα καὶ ὀκυπόροισι νέεσσιν
ἀνδρας ἐσ ἀλλοδαπούς, καὶ μοι μάλα τύγχανε πολλά.
τῶν ἔξαιρεύμην μενοεικέα, πολλὰ δ' ὀπίσσω
λάγχανον.

Two passages remain to be considered, and these do much to remove apparent discrepancies. Of prime importance is

Il. IX. 135 ff., ταῦτα μὲν αὐτίκα πάντα παρέσσεται· εἰ δέ κεν αὐτέ
άστη μέγα Πριάμοιο θεοὶ δώσωτ' ἀλατάξαι,
νῆα ἄλις χρυσοῦ καὶ χαλκοῦ νηρούσθω
εἰσελθών, ὅτε κεν δατεώμεθα ληίδ' Ἀχαιοί,
Τρωίαδας δὲ γυναικας ἑίκοσιν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθω.

This passage brings into harmony the two methods of disposing of spoil which have been illustrated above. Agamemnon says, in effect, that in the event of the fall of Troy, Achilles may choose what part of the booty he will. This is in absolute accord with Od. XIV. 232; Il. IX. 129 f. e. g., and is closely parallel to the course pursued in Il. XI. 696 f. (a passage next to be considered). The verb is in all these cases in the middle (*ἔξαιρεύμην* in Od. XIV. 232, *ἔξελόμην* in Il. IX. 130, *ἔλετο* in Il. XI. 697, and *ἔλεσθω* in Il. IX. 139), as indicating selection by the individual (contrast *δόσαν* in Il. I. 162, 276; *ἐκ δὲ ἔλον* in Il. I. 369; *ἔξελον* in Il. XVI. 56; Il. XVIII. 444; Od. VII. 10). Yet the phrase is in the present passage modified by the significant addition, *ὅτε κεν δατεώμεθα ληίδ' Ἀχαιοί*. This last, in turn,

is parallel to the many passages cited in the early part of this paper, in which the *γέρας* is assigned to the individual chieftain by the army, not by Agamemnon as commander-in-chief, or by the leader of a particular foray. It is interesting that this significant phrase occurs in the ninth book of the Iliad—the book in which it is sometimes assumed that a different conception prevails regarding the disposition of spoil. It is plain that passages like Il. IX. 188; XI. 625; XVI. 153, in which the verbs used are *ηγαγε* and *ἀρέτο*, are perfectly compatible with the idea that the army was after all the real donor, and this is explicitly stated in XI. 625.

The final passage to be considered is one of peculiar interest—the long narrative of Nestor in Il. XI. 668–762. He is telling of a foray in which as a youth he had first proved his prowess. He and his men have been successful in driving off to Pylos abundant booty. Then follows the statement that Neleus was glad *οὐνεκά μοι τύχε πολλὰ νέψ πόλεμόνδε κιόντι*. (This does not mean that the spoil was the property of Nestor (cf. Od. XIV. 231); he has merely been successful in winning it; the question of its distribution now arises.) At dawn heralds summoned all the men of Pylos to whom aught was owing from the Eleans, and, says Nestor,

*οἱ δὲ συναγρόμενοι Πυλίων ἡγήτορες ἄνδρες
δαιτρευον.*

First Neleus chooses (*ἐκ δ' εἴλετο*) what he thought would adequately reimburse him for his own losses, and then gives the rest to the people to divide,

*τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐς δῆμον ἔθωκεν
δαιτρεύειν, μή τίς οἱ ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἵσης.*

This last line is generally regarded as spurious. It is identical, save for the substitution of *δαιτρεύειν* for *δασσάμεθ'*, with Od. IX. 42 and 549 (Sittl thinks the Iliad the borrower, Gemoll the Odyssey). In the Odyssean passages the process of distribution was described in the first pers. plu., *δασσάμεθ'*, but the dat. *μοι* shows that Odysseus regarded the act as really his own: "We divided", he says, "that I might see no man defrauded of his equal share". Nestor, finally, concludes his statement about the booty with the words:

ἡμεῖς μὲν τὰ ἔκαστα διείπομεν.

All the passages of importance have now been considered, and the result is that it is not only possible, it is easy, to gather together the underlying principles and frame a consistent picture. From the spoil taken in a given foray, or accruing from the sack of a city, certain things were selected as *γέρα*, and assigned to individual chieftains, in recognition of their prowess and high station, in some cases even though they had taken no part in the expedition on which the booty had been won. The spoil was the property of the collective army, which is therefore often spoken of as the donor. At the same time the individual chieftain seems often to have selected his own *γέρας*; but this should cause no difficulty (see Od. XIV. 232 f.). Again the leader of the foray seems sometimes to assume the control of the distribution. This may well mean that he would naturally select his own *γέρας* first, or would even choose from the booty something for a friend, but the *γέρας* in either case would be regarded as the gift of the army. It is in this way that we should understand Agamemnon's promise to Teucer (Il. VIII. 287 ff.), Hector's promise to Dolon (Il. X. 305 f.), Odysseus' words in Od. XIV. 232 f., and Achilles' bestowal of Iphis upon Patroclus (Il. IX. 667 f.). From these passages it is but a step to the two isolated ones in which Agamemnon is spoken of as having given Briseis to Achilles, and we find no real discrepancy between Book IX and the rest of the poem. The *κυράζων πάθος* of Achilles explains it all.

It may be said in conclusion that we do well to remember that a man in Agamemnon's position, as commander-in-chief or overlord, however independent of him Achilles e. g. might declare himself to be, would naturally have a preponderating influence in the distribution of spoil. It remains, however, equally true that in taking to himself a prize that had been assigned to another, he was guilty of a flagrant disregard of that other's rights, and was in very truth treating him *ὡς εἰ τιν' ἀτίμητον μετανάστην*.

A. T. MURRAY.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY.

V.—MOLLE ATQUE FACETUM.

In A. J. P. XXXVII 327–332, Professor M. B. Ogle discusses the famous phrase, *molle atque facetum*, used by Horace, *Sermones*, I. 10. 44, of Vergil. He seeks—to my mind, successfully—to refute the explanation of the phrase advanced by Professor C. N. Jackson, in *Harvard Studies* 25.

But I am not sure that even Professor Ogle has seen the truth. In any event, I wish to bring forward now something that I have long suggested to my classes in connection with this phrase.

I start with the premise, urged by others (e. g. by Arthur Palmer in his note on Horace, *Sermones*, I. 10. 44, and A. Sidgwick: see below), that we must not forget that, at the time Horace wrote these words, and at the time *Sermones* I was published, Vergil had given to the world at large only his Eclogues. The Georgics were in the making, but of them the world at large had no knowledge. In a word, in seeking to determine what Horace meant here, we must hold fast to the fact that in general the *public* could have thought only of the Eclogues and of Vergil's Minor Poems. Horace himself and the members of Maecenas's circle, however, may well have seen parts of the Georgics.

Taken in its natural sense the word *facetus* has to do with pleasantries, with quips and quirks, with *ridicula*: this Quintilian's famous discussion of this passage makes plain. Why not interpret the word here too in this sense, and then see whether in the writings of Vergil known to the Roman public, or known to Maecenas's circle, at the time Horace wrote this characterization, there is anything that justifies the epithet *facetum*.

Here I prefer to speak mainly by the mouths of others—I wish to remove, as far as possible, the subjective from this paper.

In his valuable little volume, unhappily out of print, entitled *Vergil* (published in 1879), Professor H. Nettleship discussed

the Minor Poems of Vergil. On page 23, speaking of the Catalepton, he accepted as genuine the eighth poem of that collection, the little poem on the muleteer Sabinus, as "a direct parody on Catullus's fourth poem, the *Phasellus*". The third and the fourth poems in the Catalepton he characterizes as obvious imitations of Catullus's style and manner. After maintaining that the fifth poem was not written by Vergil, he adds, "If Vergil really wrote lampoons, he must have displayed in his boyhood a spirit very different from that which characterized his youth and manhood". Now, lampoons, surely, come under one definition of *facetum, facetiae*. On page 24 Mr. Nettleship described the Moretum and the Copa as "pretty and playful pieces not unworthy of Vergil's boyhood", though, he added, "there is, as far as I know, nothing in them which enables us to fix either their date or their authorship". It would not be worth while to refer to these matters were it not that, as is well known, some good scholars have inclined in recent times to accept one or more of the Minor Poems as Vergilian.¹

But I have, I hope, something more definite than this to bring forward in support of my view that *facetum* is to be taken in its ordinary sense.

¹ For some of the more recent articles on this theme see Miss S. E. Jackson, The Authorship of the *Culex*, The Classical Quarterly 5. 163-174; Theodor Birt, *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1910: see Professor H. W. Prescott's review of this book in Classical Philology 5. 381-382); F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Two Parts: Teubner, Leipzig, 1901, 1906); J. W. Mackail, *Virgil and Virgilianism: A Study of the Minor Poems Attributed to Virgil*, The Classical Review, 22. 65-73 (reprinted, in revised form, in Lectures on Poetry, 48-71: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911).

Professor Prescott, in the review referred to above, wrote as follows (page 382): "To his [Birt's] view that the poems [those in the Catalepton] are the early work of Vergil we are altogether willing to assent". Earlier (381), he had said, "In the interpretation of the Vergilian Appendix there is a perceptible drift toward granting the authenticity of many of the poems". Schanz, II, 1st, § 242, p. 103 (1911), accepts certain poems of the Catalepton as genuine. One infers from incidental remarks or references on pages 239, 240, 273, of M. S. Dimsdale's *A History of Latin Literature* (1915) that the author believes that some parts at least of the Catalepton were written by Vergil.

In his complete annotated edition of Vergil, Volume I, pages 15-16, Arthur Sidgwick, the English scholar, quoted Horace's *molle atque facetum*, and then wrote as follows, in 1890:

This criticism deserves a word of notice, as it was passed on Vergil when he was known by the Eclogues only, and by a critic who not only had generally a peculiar fineness and justness of taste, but even when speaking of his friends invariably weighed his words. The words themselves are a little difficult to render exactly: but *molle* seems to describe the 'smooth melodiousness' and *facetum* the 'refined brightness or gaiety'¹ which Horace felt to be the most striking merits of style in the Eclogues. *Both points are undoubtedly true*;¹ but though Vergil retained to the end that delicate ear and subtle sense of language which lay at the root of these qualities, no critic who knew the *Aeneid* or even the *Georgics*¹ would think of describing him by Horace's epithets. The sustained dignity of style, the purity and restrained fervour, the refined seriousness, the tenderness and pathos, the sympathy and insight into life, the profound love of beauty and of nature—in a word the mixed subtlety and elevation of his poetry—these are the points that we should bring to the front in any judgment of Vergil's work as a whole. And of these, by the light of his subsequent and greater poems, we can trace in the Eclogues the germs. Horace of course had only the Eclogues before him: he could see what Vergil was, not what he was to be.

Only twenty-three pages further on (39-40), in discussing the *Georgics*, Professor Sidgwick wrote words that form an admirable commentary, not only on the passage cited above from his Introduction, but also on our Horatian phrase. The passage must be cited in full, long as it is:²

Another point (quite as significant, though less noticeable at first sight) which shews the poet's delight in his subject is the constant emergence in the *Georgics* of what we may call a spirit of *playfulness*. Vergil's delicate and 'finely touched spirit' inclined rather to pathos and to seriousness, and in the whole *Aeneid* we have hardly the least sparkle of humour (though in the *Iliad* there is no lack of it and in the *Odyssey* it abounds): but in this poem his love of the country life, and its objects and details, not infrequently finds expression in a certain gaiety of thought or phrase which conveys to the reader a sense of his pleasure in the scenes he describes. Sometimes it is the playfulness of exaggeration: the 'rustling forest' of the lupine, the comparison (mentioned above) of the farmer's energy to a battle, the 'homes and garner' of the mouse, the weevil 'sacking'

¹ The italics are mine.

² In the quotation, as here printed, the italics are Mr. Sidgwick's.

the cornbin, the ant's 'needy old age': sometimes an amusing picture or turn of phrase, as the 'tiresome' goose (*improbus*), the *sceleratum frigus*, the raven who 'stalks solitary on the scorched sand', the tufa and chalk which 'claim that no other soil breeds snakes so well'. This playfulness is found also in the third book, as when he speaks of there being 'no limit' to a good cow's length, of the horse's 'grief' at losing and 'pride' at winning a race, of 'exhorting' the young calves while 'their mind is pliant' (*dum faciles animi*), or of the defeated bull who recovers his spirit and 'breaks camp' (*signa movet*) against the foe. But far most remarkably of all is this playfulness shewn in the fourth book, when treating of the bees. He describes in a sustained vein of humorous solemnity their whole system, social, industrial, military, and political. Thus the common bees are 'the youth' or the 'quirites': the queens are 'kings', 'high-souled leaders', who 'reign', and are revered with more than Oriental loyalty: the hive is their 'city', their 'country', their 'penates': when the bees get a wetting, it is 'Eurus plunges them in Neptune': when they do their allotted tasks they 'obey the mighty laws' or act up to the 'sure treaty bond': when they go out to drink 'they draw water under the city walls': the drones 'do not share the public burdens' (*immunes*) and 'must be slain': they have a 'long line of ancestry' and the 'fortune of their house stands sure'; and when they fight 'they make ready their arms', 'challenge the foe', 'rouse the courage of the common men' (*volgi*), blow the 'martial trump', 'form close about (*stipant*) the king', and 'tear the standards from the camp'. And lastly we are told: '*these fiery passions and fierce combats the sprinkling of a little dust controls and stills*'.

Strange that a scholar could so completely divorce two parts of his own thinking, two passages lying so close together in his own book!

In 1915 appeared M. S. Dimsdale's *A History of Latin Literature*. From this book (pages 252-253) I quote with satisfaction the following passage:

A countryman and possessed by "the glory of the countryside divine", his love for his subject is unmistakable. It shows itself in the sympathy which personifies inanimate things and attributes human feelings to the brute creation. Thus the grafted tree "marvels at strange fruits and apples not her own", and the ox "grieves" at the death of his yokefellow. It appears again in a certain playfulness which, absent from the *Aeneid*, is especially characteristic of the *Georgics*. This playfulness finds expression in the gentle irony with which the poet protests that "tufa and chalk call no other land their like to furnish dainty food and yield winding retreats for serpents" (ii. 214), in the petulance with which he refers to the goose as "incorrigible" (*improbus*) and cold as "rascally" (*sceleratum*), and in the humorous exag-

geration with which he speaks of the rustling "forest" of lupine (i. 75). This last is a note which is struck again and again in the fourth Georgic. The book opens with a declaration of the writer's intention to tell of "high-hearted chieftains and a whole nation's ordered works and ways, tribes and battles" (iv. 4). He puts himself on a level with the little folk and sees things from their point of view.

Can we believe that the poet, who, in his Georgics, displayed so markedly a spirit that no word in Latin can characterize so aptly as can Horace's *facetum*, did not display that quality in his writings as already known to the public? Further, is it conceivable that no parts of the Georgics were known by 35 B. C. (the date of the publication of *Sermones* 1) to Horace and other members of Maecenas's circle?¹

Let us, then, neglect Quintilian's words, and let us also forego such elaborate speculations as those of Professor Jackson, and interpret Horace's *facetum* in the simplest possible way, even though, to do this, we must achieve something that Quintilian found himself unable to do—forget the Aeneid and think only of the Eclogues, and such Minor Poems and parts of the Georgics as were known to Horace in 35 B. C. or earlier. After all, great as Quintilian was, he had his weak moments:

(cur miremur si) bonus dormitat Homerus?

In conclusion, we might remember that even in the Aeneid there is a touch or two of the *facetum*. Such a touch occurs in Aeneid 5. 172-182, the description of the fate of Menoetes, the helmsman who by his policy of 'Safety First' cost Gyas the race, and was thrown overboard for his pains. Note 181-182:

Illum et labentem Teucri et risere natantem
et salsos rident revomentem pectori fluctus.

Compare here the passage from Addison, *Spectator*, No. 279, cited in the edition of *Aeneid* 1-6 by Harper and Miller (1892), in the note on 5. 175-180.

¹ I may note that we may rightly characterize as an instance of *facetum* the story that appears in Donatus (Suetonius) to the effect that Vergil likened his own way of giving form to his verses to a bear's way of giving form to her cubs. It is worth while to compare—or rather, to contrast—the spirit of this personal utterance with that of Horace's famous comment on his own powers and mode of work (*Carmina*, 4. 2. 27-32).

There is another possible touch of humor in Aeneid I. 736-740:

Dixit, et in mensam laticum libavit honorem,
primaque, libato, summo tenus attigit ore;
tum Bitiae dedit increpitans; ille impiger hausit
spumantem pateram, et *pleno se proluit auro*;

Vergil's *pleno se proluit auro* is interesting, when set beside Horace's account, *Sermones*, I. 5. 15-17, of the duel of song between the *nauta* and the *viator*:

Mali culices ranaeque palustres
avertunt somnos, absentem ut cantat amicam
multa prolutus vappa nauta atque viator
certatim, etc. . . .

Mr. T. E. Page, in his edition of the Aeneid, in a note on I. 738, sees humor in the phrase *pleno se proluit auro*, "which", he continues, "Sidgwick refers to as an instance of 'Vergil's ornate-emphatic style', and which most translators try in vain to translate with dignity, whereas of course the *se proluit* is intentionally rough, cf. Hor. Sat. I. 5. 16 *multa prolutus vappa nauta* 'a sailor soaked with swipes'". I agree, decidedly, with Page against Sidgwick here. Though the poets do at times appropriate words from vulgar speech and give them entrée into good literary society (compare Ennius's use of *coquo* in Annales 335-336 [Vahlen], *curam . . . quae nunc te coquit*, and Vergil's in Aeneid 7. 345 *quam . . . femineae ardenter curaeque iraeque coquebant*, with their sole predecessors, Plautus Trin. 225, Catullus 83. 6), *proluit* in the Aeneid, taken seriously, seems too vulgar for such a passage. On the other hand, playfulness in the account of a banquet, coming as this banquet does in part at least as thanksgiving for the safety of the Trojans, is entirely in order.

CHARLES KNAPP.

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

VI.—ON THE SEMANTICS OF *-ΘΕΝ*.¹

Wine is a mocker. So is Dionysos, Lord of the *hederae sequaces*, if not, on the vegetarian theory, the ivy itself. The Riddle of the Bacchae is capable of a farcical answer. Teiresias and Kadmos may readily be conceived as comical characters. I recall a successful travesty of the great Gessler scene in Wilhelm Tell, as performed in the Volkstheater of Munich in 1852. Dead earnest becomes a live jest. The Medea Rondanini is one with the monster that protrudes her tongue while Perseus saws off her head in what might seem to the uninitiated spectator mere fun. Irony is universal. The adversative participle is one with the causative. *ἐτεί* 'whereas' = 'because', turns out to be *ἐτεί* 'whereas' = 'although'. *δρα* 'therefore' is *δρα* 'after all'. We must know how to take a joke. In English 'sure' becomes the reverse of its etymon 'securus'. One dictionary definition is 'I will admit, you will admit', as in "'Tis pleasant, sure, to see one's name in print', an archaic use, says the Concise English Dictionary, a familiar American use, at all events. It is a feeler. It is *τοι*. Some time ago in discussing the particles, I asked why 'forsooth' is invariably ironical and 'in sooth' invariably serious. I do not know. Nor do I know why *-θεν* gives a touch of irony. *δημον* is not always serious by any means. The lexicons give scope to its jesting resources. But *δηθεν* is almost invariably ironical. Why? Let me go back to A. J. P. XXXVI 109, where I was in such haste to protest against the locative theory of the cases that I misquoted from memory a line from an old Spanish romance. '¿Donde vas, adonde?' it should be. But the mistake did not invalidate the argument; and I went on to say that 'instruments of precision are installed in modern vessels to determine the direction of sounds, so unsatisfactory is the operation of the human ear'. Not long ago a distinguished man of science lauded the invention of a new instrument for the sharper determination of the whence-sound. 'Heretofore', he said, 'mariners have not been able to tell within forty-five degrees the direction from which fog signals come'. Things are going to be different now, but they were not different in the days when *-θεν* was added, or was supposed to have been added, to *δη*. 'Thou canst not tell whence it cometh'—confusion, uncertainty, mockery.

B. L. G.

¹ This *παραπλήθωμα* was left over from my discussion of the particle *δη* A. J. P. XXXVII 370.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Prodromus of Nicolaus Steno's Dissertation concerning a Solid Body enclosed by a Process of Nature within a Solid. An English Version with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes by JOHN GARNETT WINTER, with a Foreword by WILLIAM H. HOBBS. The Macmillan Company, 1916.

This work is a contribution to the history of geology, mineralogy, and palaeontology, being Part II of Volume XI (Contributions to the History of Science) in the University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series.

In a brief preface the author expresses his obligations to several scientists for assistance rendered him in the preparation of the work and to several others at home and abroad for important material and other aid given.

The foreword (six large pages) by Professor Hobbs is devoted to "The Science of the Prodromus of Nicolaus Steno" and presents the methods and results of the work. For the scientific reader this foreword is specially important, but here a few quotations must suffice. "Steno is the pioneer of the observational methods which dominate in modern science, but he was destined to pass away and be almost forgotten before the methods which he used were to be adopted by students of science." "Steno . . . was the discoverer of the fundamental law of crystallography known as the *law of constancy of interfacial angles*." Very interesting is a quotation from Steno himself: "The nurse of doubts seems to me to be the fact that, in the consideration of questions relating to nature, those points which cannot be definitely determined are not distinguished from those which can be settled with certainty".

Steno was compelled, of course, to make his theories accord with the Mosaic account of the creation and with biblical chronology, and consequently he says some things that are absurd and inconsistent.

The introduction (thirty-five pages) consists of three parts: I. The Life of Nicolaus Steno. II. The Writings of Steno. III. Bibliography of the Prodromus.

I. Steno was born at Copenhagen January 10, 1638. His name was Niels Steensen which he Latinized into Nicolaus Stenonis. As his writings bore the name of Nicolai Stenonis, it was assumed that the nominative was Steno. He received an

excellent general education in the schools and university of Copenhagen, though there is no evidence that he received a degree. He then specialized in medicine. His life at Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Leyden, and Paris must be passed over. In 1665 he is found in Florence attached as physician to the court of the Grand Duke Ferdinand II. Here he renounced Protestantism and was admitted into the Catholic Church December 8, 1667. Of the subsequent details of his life only a few can be mentioned here. In 1675 he took Holy Orders and subsequently as Vicar of Northern Germany and Scandinavia he became involved in difficulties with Protestant authorities. Moreover he practised such extreme asceticism, fasting and giving all he had or received to the poor, that even the Catholics were alienated. In 1685 he accepted a missionary call to Schwerin, "but the change meant only increased fasting and abject poverty, to which he succumbed November 26, 1686". His body was taken to Florence and laid away in the cloister of San Lorenzo. On a wall of this cloister there is a medallion portrait of Steno with a Latin inscription underneath which records the visit made by the geologists just after the congress at Bologna in 1881.

II. The writings of Steno are numerous but no complete edition of them has been published. Of the published writings there are twenty-three on anatomy, three on geology, and fourteen on theological subjects.

His researches in anatomy are important. At Amsterdam April 7, 1660, he discovered the parotid duct called *ductus Stenonianus*.

The *Prodromus* was the last of his scientific works and was written during the year following his conversion to Catholicism.

III. The bibliography of the *Prodromus* gives an account of the original edition, four reprints, an incomplete edition, and translations, closing with a list of selected references.

The translation is, of course, the essential part of Professor Winter's work. It is, on the whole, well done. The enormous sentences of the original are properly broken up, sometimes into several sentences, and occasionally even into paragraphs. The rendering is, in the main, as literal as clearness and good English would allow. It is greatly to be regretted, however, that mistranslations are not rare. A few samples will be cited. Sometimes a seemingly slight error is really very serious, as for instance when *semel iterumque* (page 2) is rendered "once or twice" (p. 206), or when *fila* (p. 43) is rendered "filings", or *longitudo* (p. 42) is omitted in translating (p. 241). Steno, speaking of man's power (*vis*) of accomplishing things contrary to the usual course of nature, mentions (p. 11) his *vim . . . inferendi mensis media Hyeme aestivos fructus*, which is

rendered " [power] of producing summer fruits in mid-winter months ". After mentioning a twofold substance in the surface of shell-bearing animals, Steno adds (p. 54) *cuius accurior indago non parum lucis afferit ossium examini*, which is rendered " a careful examination of these is as illuminating as an investigation of bones " (the plural " these " is correct). Omitting other mistranslations, the reviewer must reluctantly mention an amazing error in the introduction. In the inscription under the portrait (p. 185) occurs *ALTIORVM DOCTRINARVM*, correctly rendered (p. 186) " of Higher Studies ", and in a criticism of the Latinity of the inscription we are told that " *ALTIORVM* in line 9 should be *ALTIARVM* ".

The work is almost free from misprints.

A study of the Latinity of Steno would be interesting but out of place here. It may be remarked that he speaks of the Dissertation itself as if it were already written, the rare use of the future in speaking of it referring, no doubt, to the time of intended publication. The translator several times erroneously renders a present by a future, as *expono*, " I shall set forth "; *explico*, " I shall explain ". The Dissertation, however, was not published and seems to have been lost if it really was ever written.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

UNIVERSITY, VA.

Apulei Platonici Madaurensis de magia liber. Testo critico
con introduzione e commento di Concetto Marchesi. CITTÀ
DI CASTELLO, S. Lapi, 1914. (Collezione scientifica di
Classici Latini e Greci. Serie Latina No. 1). Pp. 221.

It is rather interesting to observe that the first Commentary in Italian and, so far as I know, the first Commentary in English on the *Apologia* of Apuleius should have been so nearly contemporaneous that one could hardly have been influenced by the other. I confess that to me, personally, Professor Marchesi's work is in nowise as helpful nor as inspiring as that of the English editors. He believes in translation rather than elucidation. So do I—in moderation. But it seems to me that Professor Marchesi, himself, illustrates at times the besetting sin of this theory. He translates too often, he sometimes translates when there seems to be no necessity for translation. Nevertheless, the Commentary is good, although to my taste it is too concise, too rigorously exclusive of background to be either interesting or inspiring.

The Introduction is excellent and in some respects is a valuable complement to the work of Messrs. Butler and Owen.

Some useful hints are given on the rhetorical construction of the speech itself, the reason why the defendant begins by discrediting his adversaries, etc. Is the speech as it now stands, the speech which Apuleius actually made in court? I agree with Marchesi in believing that it probably is. The style is very Apuleian, some of his allusions must have been over the heads of the court. But *omne ignotum pro magnifico*. Apuleius was too good a rhetorician not to appreciate the full value of illustrating that famous phrase in a case like this. I can conceive of no better method of concealing the really weak points in his defence than just the one which he pursued.

Professor Marchesi also discusses the *clausula* of Apuleius as illustrated in this speech and gives a number of interesting examples. He does not agree with the English editors in believing that F is the one ultimate source of our text. He thinks that B has an independent value, and one of the valuable features of his book is the section in which he gives the variants of that ms.

Perhaps the most interesting part of his Introduction is that in which he reviews and characterizes the religious situation. One wonders whether the world has ever seen such a state of mind as that which prevailed throughout the Roman Empire in the second century A. D. Nothing could be better than his summary of the matter on p. 40:

Era lo sfacelo della potenza e della cultura pagana, era la grandezza occidentale che si sfiniva e si dissipava attraverso le moltitudini trionfanti. L'Oriente imbarbarito si riversava coi suoi apostoli, coi suoi magni, coi suoi martiri nel cuore dell'impero e ne sconvolgeva i battiti sereni, suscitando un fermento mortale. Dalla Siria, dall'Egitto, dalla Palestina, dai territori degli antichi Fenici debellati e assoggettati, veniva l'enorme, l'irreparabile invasione a cui Roma non poteva opporre più né consoli né imperatori; era invasione di fantasmi, di spiritati, di trasognati; erano schiavi che trascinavano i liberi, erano poveri che trascinavano i ricchi nelle stesse paure e nei medesimi sacrifici. C'eran tutti insomma per la prima volta nella storia, sospinti da una potenza invisibile contro tutte le potenze reali. L'Asia riconquistava l'Europa nel nome di Dio.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Apulei *Apologia* . . . With Introduction and Commentary by H. E. BUTLER and A. S. OWEN. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1914. Pp. LXVI+95+208.

To my thinking this is by far the best edition which we have ever had of Apuleius' famous defence of himself against the

charge of using magic to win to wife a susceptible widow some twenty years his senior.

In the Introduction and Commentary, Mr. Owen is responsible for all matters of style and language and for most of the notes on magic; the remaining topics are in the hands of Mr. Butler. The Introduction which consists of 66 pp. deals with the life and works of Apuleius, the mss. of the *Apologia* and *Florida* and the style of the *Apology*. The text might be defined as a standardized version of the one published by Rudolf Helm (Teubner, 1910). The basis, therefore, is F. Mr. Butler does not believe that B is of any great value as an independent authority.

Mr. Owen's discussion of the style of the *Apology* is comparatively brief (22 pp.) and there is no attempt either here or in the Notes to give an exhaustive list of examples and authorities. But it is much more to the point and much more illuminating than any other discussion of the style of Apuleius which I have seen. Realizing, as all of us now do, that what Apuleius writes is a variety of rhetoric, not a variety of Latinity, Mr. Owen shows unusual knowledge and taste in the choice and development of the topics best calculated to illustrate the Asian style as it appears in this strange age.

The Commentary is clear and sufficient and does not claim to be 'concise'. I am rather weary of commentaries which claim to be 'concise' and I am, also, rather suspicious of them, especially of those which substitute paraphrases for explanation. Also, the Commentary is refreshingly honest. For example, the editors see no very definite meaning in *digitos aperuisse*, etc., in sec. 89. Well, who does?

Such translations as one finds here are particularly good. *Turbabat* (83), for instance, = 'ran amuck', could not be bettered. Such phrases as *montes auri* (20) and *tanti . . . estis quantum habetis* (23) are illustrated by two or three parallels. I, myself, no doubt would have given a larger number as well as the appropriate references to Otto and Sutphen. But criticism of this sort has nothing to do with the real value of the book, and is of no great consequence for any purpose. My Commentary on *Tibullus* was called too long by some, too condensed by others; some admired the feature of inserting modern echoes of the poet, others—for example, Professor Thomas—appeared to have been irritated by them, etc. What is an editor to do in the face of such criticism? Except to do as he thinks best.

The book concludes with a useful bibliography and excellent grammatical and general indices.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

M. Manilius Astronomicon, Liber Tertius, Recensuit et Enarravit A. E. HOUSMAN, Londinii, apud Grant Richards, MDCCCCXVI. Pp. XXVIII + 72.

To his edition of Manilius Book I, published in 1903, Mr. Housman adds some passages of the text of Books II, III, and IV, with emendations of his own. In the present edition of Book III thirty-six asterisks occurring in the notes to thirty-four separate verses indicate the editor's conjectures. Twenty-three of these verses, including the words indicated by twenty-five asterisks, are in exact correspondence with the readings published in 1903 with the single exception of 'circum volitans' (vs. 369) for the earlier 'circumvolitans'. There remain then eleven passages in which the conjectures of 1916 differ from those of 1903. Six of these passages contain entirely new conjectures; the remaining five have been emended in a form slightly different from that of the earlier emendation. In the 1916 text there are seven instances of a return from earlier conjectures to the MS. tradition; and there is one instance of a similar return from a conjecture of Bentley's which Mr. Housman had previously accepted.

The earlier transposition of vs. 238 to a position between 233 and 234 is rejected; that of vss. 411, 412 between 407 and 408 is retained; and another transposition is made—that of vss. 473, 474, to a position between 467 and 468. Vss. 268-270 are bracketed both in the 1916 and in the earlier text. Vss. 317 and 508 are bracketed in the 1916 text. Mr. Housman adds four new verses, 216 A, 417 A, 549 A and 549 B.

Mr. Housman has already indicated his principles of emendation (Book I, pp. liii, liv): 'An emendator with one method is as foolish a sight as a doctor with one drug. The scribes knew and cared no more about us and our tastes than diseases care about the taste of doctors; they made mistakes not of one sort but of all sorts, and the remedies must be of all sorts too'. It follows from this that he has no especial system other than the system of 'res et ratio', which seems to be pretty consistently applied. It is of course clear that properly to appreciate all the conjectures would require a knowledge of the principles of text criticism and of the subject matter of Manilius equal to that of Mr. Housman; if such requirement were enforced upon the present reviewer this review would be delayed indefinitely. The editor's independence of judgment and keenness of vision can be seen on every page of the Commentary. Good examples of his manner of dealing with the text may be found in vss. 71, 121, 285, 507, to mention no others.

The Commentary is written in Latin, and has the same objects which the editor professed before (Book I, p. lxxii). 'This Com-

mentary is designed to treat of two matters only: what Manilius wrote, and what he meant.' The connection between the two is not always obvious, and Mr. Housman's learning and ingenuity have had reasonable scope for their exercise. Perhaps the most noticeable single achievement in the field of interpretation occurs at vs. 275, where he penetrates to the meaning of the Manilian 'stade'—an arc of the equator which takes two minutes to rise.

The subject matter of Manilius—to the average student perhaps the least important part of the present volume—is analysed in the Introduction, written in English. The Introduction and Commentary require to be compared at almost every line; and with their aid even the reader who is innocent of astrology can get a good idea of Manilius' discussion. Book III follows the doctrine of the zodiac and the dodecatropos of Book II with an exposition of the circle of the twelve *athla*, the method of finding the horoscope and kindred matters.

Those who search this volume for examples of Mr. Housman's earlier manner may find them; they are not conspicuous and therefore not irritating. He has apparently a greater admiration for the style of Manilius than for his intellectual honesty. On page XXI of the Introduction to Book I Manilius is referred to as 'the one Latin poet who excels even Ovid in verbal point and smartness'; on page VI of the Introduction to Book III we read 'Liars need not have long memories if they address themselves only to fools who have short ones; and an astrological poet writing his third book may safely forget his second, because an astrological reader will never remember it'. And on page XIX Manilius is referred to as 'facile and frivolous'. Various bits from the Commentary are: 611, *Si me Manilius usus esset consultore*; 414, *Librae Sidera (id est, quod Iacobi et puerorum causa dico, Libra)*, 451 (of Scaliger's comments) *quamquam ne has quidem nugas tanto opere admiror quam Bentley silentium*; 617, *Fayus et Bechertus Gemblacensi obsecuti sunt, natali, ut opinor, morbo tracti; Breiterus sua semita delirare maluit*.

However, Mr. Housman is unique. He understands the subject matter of Manilius, and as a text critic is inferior to nobody. The Third Book maintains his previous high standard of severe scholarship. Those who object to his sarcasm may take refuge in his learning; and those who grow weary of the intellectual labor required to comprehend either Housman or Manilius should find recreation in the occasional eloquence of the author and the rather more frequent wit of his editor.

EDWARD W. NICHOLS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Recueil de Textes Latins Archaiques, by ALFRED ERNOUT.
Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1916. Pp. VIII + 289.

This book is made up of epigraphical texts, running in point of time from the ancient Forum inscription to the *lex Cornelia*, of half a dozen pages of early prose, of specimens of Latin verse from the time of Livius Andronicus to that of Laberius, and of an index of Latin words.

The purpose of the editor in selecting his extracts, as he says in his preface, is to show the evolution of the language, to bring out dialectal differences, and to illustrate the beginnings of the different genres of Latin poetry. In making his commentary he has aimed to solve the various difficulties which present themselves, and "to omit nothing which is essential". The first part of this programme has been carried out successfully. The selection is well made, and approved texts have been followed for the literary fragments.

In attaining his second object the editor has not been so fortunate. There are at least four different fields of study suggested by these fragments. The study of the language engages our attention, the study of the literary style, of early literary history, and of the points of political or archaeological interest involved. Unfortunately the editor is so preoccupied with linguistic matters that other subjects receive practically no attention. Even in the field of language the vocabulary, as well as the syntax and the growth of its principles, is passed over. So far as style goes, there is no discussion of those characteristic features of it, which, for instance, Altenburg has brought out in his monograph *De sermone pedestri Italorum vetustissimo*, and nothing is said about its gradual development. The failure to give the student any help in literary history is still more unfortunate. So far as the reviewer has noticed, nothing is said about any one of the genres of literature represented here, not even about the mime, the farce, or the *togata* with which the reader who is taking up the study of early Latin would hardly be familiar. There are practically no comments on the verse of Ennius, and the Saturnian verse receives no attention whatever. If the editor did not wish to take these topics up in his commentary it would have been a simple matter to refer the student to the pertinent literature.

In the same way difficulties and questions of considerable literary importance arising in particular inscriptions or fragments pass without explanation or comment. For instance, vv. 9-11 in no. 141 are much in need of a comment, and Horace's reference to a passage in the laws of the Twelve Tables in one of his Satires (II. i) was deserving of notice. It would have

been interesting also to have had a word on Wölfflin's theory that Ennius was the author of certain of the Scipionic epitaphs. His discussion of the point would have been accessible to most French students in the *Revue de Philologie*, and in this connection something might have been said of the six-verse structure of the three important Scipionic inscriptions (nos. 13-15) and its significance.

Of minor points no use is made of *Teurano*, without ablative *-d*, in proving to the student that the forms of no. 126 are more archaic than those which one would find in a contemporary non-legal extract, although this form furnishes the only sure clue in the matter. In no. 132 *senatu* is probably not a genitive form, but the result of the mistake made by the stone cutter who was led astray by the preceding *de* and the following *s-*. The famous inscription to Maarcus Caicilius (no. 135) is probably not "contemporaine d'Accius", but is clearly an archaic composition, perhaps of the imperial period. On the other hand the editor seems to think that the inscription on the *Columna Rostrata* (no. 147) was composed outright in the imperial period. It seems to the reviewer however that Wölfflin's analysis of the language and style of this inscription has made such a theory untenable. Two slight misprints have been noticed. On p. 64 near the bottom *dans dans* for *dans*, and in the transcription on p. 67 we should have *habere* or *habuisse* at both points in the text, not *habere* in one place and *habuisse* in the other.

The reviewer has felt compelled to call attention to the fact that Ernout's book fails to take into account certain important aspects of the study of archaic Latin, but it is only fair to say that it contains the best collection of specimens of Latin which we have for the early period, and that in the discussion of forms, to which Professor Ernout has largely restricted himself, his comments, as we might expect from his contributions in that field, are sound and judicious.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

Virgil's "Gathering of the Clans": Observations on Aeneid VII, 601-817. By W. WARDE FOWLER, Oxford; B. H. Blackwell, 1916. pp. 1-96.

Hirtzel's text is accompanied by Mr. James Rhoades' blank verse translation of the passage. In a ten-page introduction Mr. Fowler calls attention to the magnificent pageant portrayed in Virgil's lines, no mere dry catalogue of forces but

an inspiring gathering of the clans. The task was not easy, for Virgil "had to hold firmly together the sympathies of Romans and Italians—to aid the new policy of Augustus toward Italian unity", but he succeeded and "skillfully safeguarded the Italian spirit with his artistic resources." The real significance of these splendid lines is thus rightly emphasized. To neglect them or to miss their significance is to lose one of the finest episodes in the *Aeneid*. Mr. Fowler compares Virgil's pageant to the catalogue of ships in the second *Iliad* to the disparagement of the Homeric description, and it is to be noted that the Homeric authenticity of the catalogue is vigorously denied by the best modern scholarship. In a similar description, *Silius Italicus*, a second rate imitator of Virgil, overdoes the details and bores the reader. "We cannot see the woods for the trees." Milton (*Paradise Lost* II), following Virgil, achieves success and may be thought to surpass his model.

Mr. Fowler selects some twenty passages for detailed comment. His intimate familiarity with all phases of Roman religion makes his observations a valuable addition to the regular commentaries. He points out a confusion in Virgil's description of the Gates of War in ll. 607-10 and reconciles the appearance of Mars and Janus in these four lines. Under l. 620, *Regina deum*, he says that "the position of Juno at Rome was at no time a very important one and for that reason a Roman poet might use her with a fair amount of license." This entire note deserves attention. Mr. Fowler would transfer ll. 664-9 from *Aventinus* and apply them to the description of *Ufens* to follow l. 749. His argument is convincing, although *Herculeus amictus* of l. 669 may not altogether explain the original misplacement. His handling of the text in ll. 695-6 is less convincing and the difficulty in *acies* and *arces* is doubtless due to an unfinished text. We are especially grateful for the rescue from the "imbecilities" of editorial comment of the fine simile in ll. 674-77, the picture of the *nubigenæ Centauri* swiftly descending the mountain from its cloud-capped summit over fields of snow, through stately pinewoods, to crash through the underwoods at the foot of the mountain. A good example of Mr. Fowler's human kind of comment is found on ll. 689-90. The left foot of the slinger is kept naked to gain a grip on the ground. Mr. Fowler compares the cricketer's management of his feet. Contemporary discussion of the "golf-foot" might be cited. For a good example of Mr. Fowler's illuminating comment read his observations on ll. 750-60: *Umbro*, the snake-charmer; *nemus Angitiæ; flevere*. The notes end with a charming comment on *florentes* of l. 804. If this is "amateur" scholarship (Gilbert Murray), may heaven send us more of it. This is to make right use of our classical inheritance. Listen to a sentence from Mr.

Fowler's preface: "In the darkest year that Europe has known since the tenth century, being too old and deaf to be of any active service to the country, I have found myself invigorated by fresh reading of Homer, Virgil, Milton, Wordsworth, and some of the poets who like them are my very old friends."

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Mythology, edited by H. B. WALTERS. With 580 Illustrations. Cambridge, at the University Press: New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916. 1103 pp. \$6.50.

The general quality of this useful manual may be inferred from the statement that it is based "to a certain extent" on the Companions to Greek and Latin Studies recently issued by the Cambridge University Press. It is primarily a dictionary of classical antiquities, for the use of students at the Universities and in the upper forms of Public Schools. But, in order that the student may have before him the whole field of classical literature, "the scope of the work has been extended to include also all proper names coming under the headings of geography, biography, and mythology, which are likely to come before the notice of the ordinary reader". This list of proper names is incomplete; there is no mention of Virgil's friend Varus, of the lakes Benacus and Larius, of Petronius, or Claudian, or Ausonius, of Calpurnius or Nemesianus. There is a careless statement at p. 793, that the elder Pliny was born "at Novum Comum on the lake of that name". And there are one or two doubtful statements which hardly deserve to be set forth with all the authority of a dictionary. It is by no means certain that Virgil's *fatidica Manto* was the "daughter of Heracles"; and there is surely very little ground for saying that Propertius "appears to have married the lady whom he addresses as Cynthia in his poems". After all that has been written on the question of allegory in the Eclogues, it takes some courage to say that Virgil himself "regards them as allegorical; the flocks are the Roman people, or rather mankind, united under the protection of Imperial Rome, and he himself is a principal shepherd". The treatment of the 'antiquities' proper is much more satisfactory, though there are a few slight inaccuracies even here. The Pont du Gard is "near Nismes" (p. 87), not "at Nismes" (pp. 44, 677); and its height is nearer 160 ft. than 180 ft. Domitian's celebration of the *ludi saeculares* was in 88 A. D., not 83. The

article on *Aenigma* might mention the riddle in Petronius, c. 58, and a whole book of riddles by Symphosius, in the Anthology. On p. 228 there is a hard saying about the *cicada*: "Though mentioned by Virgil and Ovid, it was, in ordinary life, hardly noticed by the unpoetical Romans". In the headings, some of the long vowels are left unmarked, and *Caliga* (181) is wrong. There are a few misplaced accents, *νεώκορος* (20), *παιδότριβης* (463), *φώσφορος* (493), *Ἐώσφορος* (493). 'Apoxyomeus' (955) should be 'Apoxyomenos'. 'St. Rémy' (103) should be 'St. Remy'.

W. P. MUSTARD.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

HERMES XLVIII.

Fascicle 1.

Die Abfassungszeit von Ovids Metamorphosen (1-13). M. Pohlenz makes it plausible that Ovid inserted the characterization of Actaeon's innocence Metam. (III 142) after he had gone into exile (cf. Tr. II 103 ff.; IV, 10, 89; I, 3, 37; III 5, 49). These and other passages make it probable that our text of the Metamorphoses is based on a copy that was partially revised by Ovid himself.

Zu den neuen Bruchstücken der Epitrepones (14-28). S. Sudhaus approves Robert's 'Zu den Epitrepones des Menander' (Sitzungsb. d. Berl. Akad. 2 Mai 1912) and tries, with conjectures, to advance the interpretation. He regards the Petersburg fragment, which Körte relegates to an appendix, as the conclusion of the first act.

Das Pneuma im Lykeion (29-74). W. W. Jaeger bases a discussion of Aristotle's doctrine of pneuma and of its modification by his successors, mainly on the two documents: *περὶ ζῷων κινήσεως*, the genuineness of which he elaborates interestingly, and the anonymous *περὶ πνεύματος*, of which ch. 1-8 he regards as an abstract of a peripatetic lecture, reported by a follower of the Stoic Chrysippus, who sets forth his own views in ch. 9 (cf. A. J. P. XXXIV, p. 222). Aristotle may be regarded as the personified conscience of Hellenic tradition; he is the oldest extant advocate of the doctrine of the *σύμφυτον πνεῦμα*, which he derived from the Sicilian school of Diocles and Philistion. His view of the seat of perception and motion is evenly balanced between psychical and physiological tendencies, the former rooted in the speculative schools of southern Italy, which Plato made so prominent, the latter in the realistic empiricism of Ionia. The successors of Aristotle came under the influence of the physiological teaching of Praxagoras of Cos, through the instrumentality of Erasistratus, of whose career and doctrines J. gives an interesting account.

L'entretien de Scipion l'Africain et d'Hannibal (75-98). M. Holleaux discusses the fictitious anecdote of a conversation between Hannibal and Scipio, purported to have taken place at Ephesus 193 b. c., at which Hannibal is reported as saying that if he had conquered Scipio he would have placed himself above Alexander and Pyrrhus (cf. Livy XXXV, 14, 5-12; Appian,

Syr. 10. 11; Plutarch, *Titus* 21). He regards the vague account of conversations held by Scipio with Hannibal, related by Zonaras IX, 18, 12-13 (i. e. Cassius Dio, I 285 Boissevain), as the first timid beginnings of the above story; but, the statement that Scipio proceeded to Asia after a mission to Africa in 193 B. c., Holleaux regards as historical. This he tries to corroborate by means of the Delian decree granting a crown to Scipio 189 B. c. (Dürrbach BCH. XXVIII (1904) 271 ff.).

Zu den Persern des Timotheus (99-140). B. Keil contributes a number of textual emendations, with illuminating discussions of the various conjectures that have been offered, as well as of the peculiarities of Timotheus' diction and art. The *όμφαλός* closes with the lamentations of the king vv. 191-209; and that this passage demanded the highest pathos of the soloist is indicated, not only by v. 190 *φάτο δὲ κυμαίνων τύχαισι*, but by its beginning with the quotation *ἴω κατασκαφαὶ δόμων* from Aesch. *Choephoroi* v. 50. This bravura passage is followed by the first note of victory, expressed in a modified Alcaic strophe, which begins with the exulting rhythm of *Νῦν χρὴ μεθύσθην*. Indeed this famous fragment of Alcaeus may possibly be amplified with vv. 213/4 *ἐπεκτίπεον ποδῶν ἴψικροτος χορείας* (cf. Horace's 'pede pulsanda tellus'). These five verses (210-214) seem to have an echo in the last five (249-253), which, with their Alcaic rhythms, frame in the sphragis; moreover the first group (210-214) constitute the *μετακατατροπά* of the Nomos, following the *όμφαλός*, where Westphal located it in opposition to Pollux (cf. Proleg. zu Aesch. *Trag.* p. 76).

Miscellen: M. Wellmann (141-143) adduces further evidence for the identification of the authorship of the physician Herodotus (cf. A. J. P. XXVIII, p. 99).—F. Boll (143-145) classifies in Horace's second book of Satires: I and V, II and VI, III and VII, IV and VIII, under the headings: Consultation, Ländliches Genügen, Saturnalienpredigt, Gastrosofie. A twofold arrangement in Sat. I, in imitation of Vergil's Bucolics, has been recognized (cf. Kiessling-Heinze (1910), p. XXI).—S. Sudhaus (145-146) restores vv. 96-100 of Menander's *Perikeiomene*.—F. Leo (147) publishes a new verse of Laberius found on a marble slab from a Columbarium.—Ch. Huelsen (148-153) emends a votive inscription to Emperor Claudius with the aid of a drawing recently discovered, and cites three other similar inscriptions.—H. Schenkl (153-156) discusses the construction of Hermes' lyre in Sophocles' *'Ιχνευταί*, especially by means of an emendation of the fragment in Pollux 10, 34, which Robert (*Hermes* XLVII, p. 558 ff.) had applied to Maia's bed. (Cf. A. J. P. XXXVII, p. 492.)—B. Keil (156-157) produces an example of the form *ναύστης*.

(= *ναύτης*), from a Mummy label (cf. Art and Arch. v. 1, p. 9). G. Kaibel had deduced it from the verb *ἐναυτολόγησε* (Hermes XIX (1884), 324).—Paul Maas (157–159), suggests that, as Varro knew that the space the finger moves up the string to produce the fourth is one-half the distance required for the octave (i. e. e—a=a—e'), and as the interval e—a contains five half-tones and a—e' seven, he used this fact as an analogy when asserting that the penthemimeral caesura divided the hexameter into equal halves (cf. Gellius XVIII, 15, 2).—H. Jacobsohn (159–160) discusses <*τρ*>*έπονσαι* (Papyrus Gies- sen I, 1, nr. 17; Wilcken Chrestomathie nr. 481) in the sense of 'umstimmen'.—Georg Jacob (160) publishes a passage from a work of the Turkish geographer Evlija (XVII cent.) describing the vestibule of the Selimje at Adrianople, a masterpiece of Sinan (XVI cent.), which contained twenty-six different columns, 'most of them from a theatre in Athens, not far from the Peloponnesus'.

FASCICLE 2.

Die schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias (161–223).—G. Pasquali tries to show that Pausanias cast his *παντοδαπής ιστορία* into a traditional form of the periegesis, which he derives from a sketch of its history. He begins this with Herodotus who developed the Ionic geography and historiography. One hundred and fifty years later we come upon the fragmentary papyrus of Hawara, which Wilcken has made available (Genethliakon für Robert p. 191 ff.). This belongs to the beginning of the III century B. C. and furnishes the oldest example of a periegesis; of Diodorus, the oldest periegete, hardly more than titles of works are known. A few decades later, about 250 B. C., we find a few fragments from *τερὶ τῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλεων* of Heracleides the Critic. This work is not strictly in line with the antiquarian type of periegesis; but it illustrates the invasion of rhetoric, foreshadowing the literary ambition of Pausanias. Next in order, still in the III century, we come to Heliodorus, the fragments of whose works have been collected by B. Keil (cf. A. J. P. XVII, p. 381), and in the II century B. C. we have the famous periegete Polemon. That Strabo resembles Pausanias in places is mentioned, but not utilized. Other periegetical works, the titles of which are known, are passed in rapid review. From the foregoing works Pasquali derives a literary form, in which, following a topographical thread, monuments are arbitrarily selected and briefly described in a dry style; measurements are noted rather than artistic qualities; further the accounts of monuments etc. are diversified with historical excursuses and anecdotes of *θαυμάσια*. All of this can be found in Pausanias; but, alas! 'Pausanias

missbraucht die althergebrachte Form der Periegese.' Pasquali rejects the suggestion of Trendelenburg that Pausanias' work should be entitled 'Ελληνικά rather than 'Ελλάδος Περιήγησις; also the common belief that the division into books was not original. He accepts Robert's identification of Pausanias with the Syrian author of *κτίσεις* (cf. Robert l. c. p. 271 ff.), calling attention to the various *κτίσεις* of Polemon.

Ptolemaios und Heron (224-235). Ingeborg Hammer-Jensen places Heron's date even later than 50 A. D. (cf. Christ-Schmidt Gr. Lit. II 219), for he must have come after Ptolemy (100-178 A. D.) as appears from the more advanced stage of the scientific methods and instruments employed by Heron. The explanation why a diver does not suffer from the pressure of water (*Pneumatica* p. 22, 14 ff.), is clearly directed against Ptolemy (Op. II 263 ff.), a strange inquiry in the light of [Arist.] Probl. XXXII, 2.3.11 διὰ τὸ τὰ ὡτα ἐν τῷ θαλάττῃ ρήγνυνται τοῖς κολυμβῶσιν. Further the interest in mechanical inventions in the III century A. D., and their patronage by L. Aelius H. Dionysius, who was praefectus urbi 301 A. D., also curator operum publicorum, makes it probable that he was the Διονύσιος λαμπρότατε to whom Heron dedicated his Definitions. [The authorship of these is questioned. Cf. Christ-Schm. Gr. Lit. II, p. 220.] This late date for Heron would show that Ammianus Marcellinus referred to him and his automaton theatre in XIV, 6, 18.

'Ρόδον κτίσται (236-249). Chr. Blinkenberg considers the Rhodian Λίνδος, Ἰάλυσος, Κάμπος pre-Doric names, which were retained, however, without the myths of their foundation. They appear for the first time in Iliad B 656, where they furnish only nine ships, an indication that this passage was composed before the colonial expansion of the island, which began about 700 B. C. The earliest tradition of Rhodian *κτίσται* appears in Pindar, Polygnotus and Herodotus, and probably originated in the period of city rivalries (700-500 B. C.). B. discusses the various myths and their contamination, including the versions in Diodorus V 55 ff.

Philologische Kleinigkeiten (250-273). R. Reitzenstein contributes three studies: I, A revision of the text of the Ciris (vv. 1-20, 42-53, 191-205, and 54-91), with an ample commentary. He expresses the hope that he has shown the need of interpreting this 'late' poem. II, Tacitus, Ann. II 88, refers with the phrase 'scriptores senatoresque eorundem temporum' to two sources, a senator and a scriptor. Germanists (Vogt-Koch, Gesch. d. Deutschen Lit. I³, p. 4; Paul Grundriss d. Germ. Phil. II² 1, p. 39) think that this famous passage reveals an old Arminius ballad, which is suggested by the words (l. c.) 'caniturque adhuc barbaras apud gentes'. But 'canere' means

merely 'celebrare', which R. shows by means of Greek and Latin citations. III, Cicero used 'adipalis' in *Orator* § 25, not *adipatae*. Both words are classic. The *Thesaurus*, however, makes it appear that *adipalis* was a new formation.

Ein verschollenes Werk des älteren Plinius (274-282). M. Lehnerdt investigates the tradition of the existence of a MS. of Pliny's *Bellorum Germaniae* ll. XX. Q. Aurelius Symmachus (Epist. IV, 18, 16) promised to procure his friend Protadius a copy 396 A. D. A thousand years later (1427 A. D.) Nicolas of Cusa told Poggio Bracciolini that he had seen this history in Germany. This statement of Nicolas is reliable, and is possibly the basis of frequent later reports of the existence of this lost work in Germany.

Nachlese auf griechischen Schlachtfeldern (283-291). U. Kahrstedt, from a personal inspection of the battlefield of Plataea, determines the movements of the Lacedaemonians, with references to Grundy's map (Battle of Plataea), which he criticizes. From a similar examination of the battlefield of Sellasia he concludes that Kromayer's plan (Ant. Schlachtfelder II) has, at least, not been disproved by Sotiriadis (BCH. XXXIV, XXXV). Polybius' account is excellent.

Miscellen: L. Schmidt (292-295) discusses the Germanic tribes over whom the Romans placed as ruler (19 A. D.) the Quadian Vannius. They were probably chiefly Marcomanni, although Tacitus applies the collective name Suebi to them in *Hist.* III 5 and 21. Later the rule of Vannius seems to have been extended over his own Quadi, who, at least at the time of the Marcomannic war, were the predominant element; for Emperor Marcus called them Quadi, as is shown by the subscriptio at the end of the first book of his *Eis ēavrōv*.—P. Maas (295-299) discusses the epigram at the end of Marcus' *Eis ēavrōv*. The meter proves that it is pre-Byzantine. It occurs also in the Anthol. Pal. XV 23, which is probably due to Arethas, a contemporary of Constantinus Cephalas, and a leader in the circle in which and for which the Anthology was made, and in which the Byzantine Anacreontics originated.—L. Deubner (299-304) explains the words: ἐκκορὶ κορὶ κορώνῃ(ν) (Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* I, 8) or, as they appear in the scholion to Pind. Pyth. III 32, ἐκκόρει κόρει κορώνας, as a wedding exhortation to the groom at the door of the bridal chamber. The correct form was ἐκκόρει κορικορώνη, sensu obscoeno (cf. Aelian h. a. III 9), showing a kind of reduplication like χελιχελώνη (Pollux IX 125).—H. Mutschmann (304-308) cites Prodicus' distinction of πράττειν as action, and ποιεῖν as creation, to show that ποιητικοῦ πράγματος τεταγμένην τέχνην in Isocrates XIII 12 refers to the elementary

art of the *γράμματα*, which is tangible, and can be taught according to definite rules; whereas rhetoric, like politics, is an *ἐπιστήμη πρακτική*, which eludes such definite treatment. Süss, in his "Ethos" (cf. W. K. P. 1911, 1116 ff.), failed to solve the difficulties of this passage (cf. Gercke A. J. P. XIX 228).—H. Jacobsohn (308–310) considers 'Arrápios (BCH. XXXIV, 242 ff.) and 'Ασσηρίτης (Steph. Byz. s. v. 'Ασσηρά) as ethnica of *Ασσαρά*, and, discussing the phonology, cites parallels.—H. Jacobsohn (311–312) refers, for an explanation of the synizesis of Antium in Ovid Met. 15, 718, to his article on Ansio (cf. A. J. P. XXXIII, 348 Misc.), in which the change of *ti>si* indicates a local dissyllabic pronunciation.—S. Tafel (312–314) gives an account of a few leaves of a Latin glossary (s. IX), which he found pasted on the inside of the wooden covers of a rent-roll of the year 1457.—K. Praechter (315–318) shows by citations, that Cic. de nat. deor. II, 33, 83 combined the Stoic personification of air with the Stoic doctrine of sense perception; both ideas, separately, are probably from Posidonius.—O. Kern (318–319) calls attention to a bronze group from Arcadia, now in the national museum at Athens, representing dancing figures with ram's-heads, which, combined with various passages (cf. Servius, Verg. Bucol. prooem. p. 4, 7 Th.), makes it appear that tityroi were ram-daemons, and satyrs, goat-daemons.—B. Keil (319–320) has found a scholion in Parisin. gr. 2995, which identifies the poet referred to at the beginning of Aristides' Rome-oration as Pindar, whose style is reflected in *κατὰ χρυσόκερω λιβανῶν*.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLIV, 1 AND 2.

Fascicolo 1.

La composizione dell' 'Orator' ciceroniano (1–22). Remigio Sabbadini gives an interesting analysis of Cicero's *Orator*, in which he shows, regarding the two parts (1–139 and 140–238) into which the work is evidently divided, that part first was composed on two occasions, the one immediately following the other. The original design consisted of sections I, III, V and was the text of a private letter to Brutus. The even sections II, IV, VI were inserted when Cicero decided to add the second part and publish the whole as a book. As for the treatment in general, it is more confused than is usual even with Cicero when dealing with such subjects. One of the chief difficulties seems to have been that he undertook to look up the authorities on the *clausula* between the publication of the first and second part,

and managed to confuse himself and everyone else with the result.

Varia (23-40). Pietro Rasi discusses the text of Catal. XIV, 1-10; Iuven. I, 85 ff.; Verg. Georg. IV, 132 ff. from the point of view of metre.

Rutilio Namaziano e Lorenzo Valla (41-46). Vincenzo Ussani discusses the proemium of Lorenzo Valla's famous *De linguae latinae elegantia*, points out the imitation therein of Rutilius Namatianus, *De Reditu*, I, 81 ff. and discusses the text which Valla may have used.

Notizie di Papiri Ercolanesi inediti (47-66). Domenico Bassi examines Papyrus 1670, and so far as possible restores and prints the text. The theme is somewhat uncertain, but Bassi concludes that what we have here are the remains of a polemic against the Stoic doctrine of Providence.

Intorno alla obbiettività storica nei discorsi Tucididei (67-90). Emanuele Ciaceri after a careful and exhaustive analysis of this question comes to the following conclusion: Thucydides inclines to make his orators say not so much the things which they really did say or which on the given occasion they were reported to have said, as the things which in all probability they really thought. It follows as a sort of corollary that what Thucydides makes his orators say is just what they did not say on the given occasion.

ΚΑΣΙΤΝΗΤΟΣ (91-96). Francesco Ribezzo explains this word as *αὐτο-καστί-γνητος*, i. e. *αὐτῇ τῇ μητρὶ γενέτος*, 'eadem concipiente genitus'.

La declinazione greca e latina dei temi in -iā (97-103). Oreste Nazari takes up this question but does not come to any very definite conclusion.

I verbi denominativi greci in -άω -εω -οω -ίω -ύω (104-106). Oreste Nazari concludes that the change of -άω to -άω in verbs of that type is due to the analogy of verbs originally ending in -άω and that the change was also influenced by the verbs in -εω -οω -ίω -ύω whereas outside the present tense the forms in -άσω -ώσω -ίσω -ύσω are on the contrary due to the analogy of verbs originally in -άσω, Ion-Att. -ησω.

Spizzico di etimologie latine e greche (107-113). In this article, also by Nazari, are examined the contrasted pair *ebrius-sobrius*, also Lat. -met, -te, and *τράγος*.

*Xenophontis *Memor.* IV, 4 (114-127).* C. O. Zuretti points out that as compared with Plato it is Xenophon who gives us the real Hippias, with his training, with his ideas, and even with his human weaknesses.

BRIEF MENTION.

In lieu of thoughts that wander through eternity, my meditations turn on the various phases of study through which I have passed in my long life, the various shifting of the point of view that I have noted in myself and in others. Not the least interesting of St. Augustine's works is the treatise entitled 'Retractationes' and if I had not postponed the publication of my grammatical views until I had reached an age when one crystallizes, if not fossilizes, I might hope to rival those of my fellowworkers, who are perpetually reconsidering their positions. In other ranges I have shifted my point of view often enough. One of my potwalloping jobs was the sub-editorship of Johnson's Cyclopaedia—a work withdrawn from the market in the interest of later enterprises in the same line—and a review of my performances as an encyclopaedist would reveal all manner of disproportions. To be sure, I was admonished to keep within narrow limits and rather prided myself on compressing what I had to say or to copy within a small compass, and yet I who dared to criticize the President of Magdalen for his slighting mention of one Aristoxenus (A. J. P. XI 125) was content to dismiss in a few lines the important figure of Posidonius.

Not long ago seduced by Gilbert Murray's enthusiastic recommendation and also by a pleasant stroll through Mr. J. R. K. THOMSON's *Greek Tradition*, I undertook to read the same author's earlier work *Studies in the Odyssey*, but I found that I could not make my way through the meshes of the net with which he encompasses Odysseus and Penelope. To me, as to the Greeks with whom I have to do, Odysseus and Penelope are man and woman and gain nothing by being evaporated into misty god and mistier goddess, and so I don't care a button—οὐδὲ γρῦ—whether Poseidon was originally an agricultural god or no. To me his horses are the white-maned coursers of the sea, and his other self, Aigeus, the lord of the butting and bounding billows, like the butting and bounding creatures that disturbed my meditations as I was making my way through a sunken road in the Peloponnesus (A. J. P. XXVIII 239). A highly unscientific attitude doubtless, but I prefer to study my Greeks from the inside, even if my critics should compare my darkened vision to that of Jonah in the belly of the whale. It

is no joy to me to be told that the Minyans of Pindar's Fourth Pythian ought to have recognized that in migrating to Kyrene they were simply going back to first principles when Medea told them :

ἀντὶ δελφίνων δ' ἐλαχυπτερύγων ἵππους ἀμείψαντες θοάς,
ἀνία τ' ἄντ' ἔρετρων δίφρους τε νυμάσοισιν ἀελλόποδας.

The familiar story of the Abderites and the Andromeda of Euripides, of which Wieland has made so much in his Abderiten has a parallel in my own student life in Germany. Only, the Abderites admired the scraps of the Andromeda which they declaimed, whereas the books of the opera which we cited were quoted in derision. Some of them were utterly lacking in grammar. Others were bathetic. One from the *Zauberflöte* still sings in my brain :

In diesen heil'gen Hallen
Kennt man die Rache nicht.
Und ist der Mensch gefallen
Führt ihn zurück zur Pflicht.

As an offset to this rings the cry, *Die Rache siegt*, from the *Freischütz*. Both these utterances wake their echoes in these cruel times of conflicting thunders. It is indeed hard in such an era of storm and stress to keep one's balance, to give scope to righteous indignation and to do justice to a past of peaceful aspiration. I was almost surprised to find that in his eloquent lecture on *Patriotic Poetry in Greek and English*, my friend RHYS ROBERTS has given considerable space in his *Notes and References* to a laudation of German achievements in classical philology, a striking contrast to a broadside delivered by a French writer against Germany's claims to preëminence in science. No wonder that it stirred wrath, 'holy wrath' of course, throughout the Empire, claiming as Germany does preëminence in every kind of 'Wissenschaft'. The attack, it is true, is aimed chiefly at German achievements in physical science, but it involves more than that. It involves the basic character of the German mind, what we are pleased to call nowadays German mentality. According to Dr. ACHALME the German is 'patient, méticuleux, pratique, avec des accès de subjectivisme et de mysticisme, mais envieux, insolent, menteur, plein de contradictions, sans initiative, sans élégance et sans scrupules'. Dr. ACHALME seems to have learned what Burke did not know, 'the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people'. Individual German scholars may show some of the unlovely traits designated in this formidable charge; and

I have not hesitated to point out from time to time illustrations of Dr. ACHALME's thesis. But as I set forth in a recent number of the JOURNAL, we must not take our bill and cancel it, and so improve on the example of the unjust steward. I have not yielded unduly to German authority, though I have been charged with that, as I have been with every sin in the philological decalogue—if there is such a thing outside of Ritschl's Ten Commandments in which Sanskrit was put under the ban.¹ Heroes I have had in my time of course. I am sorry for the 'valet-souled varlet' who hasn't had them. Carlyle was one of the earliest. Then Goethe. But before Carlyle and Goethe came Elijah the Tishbite as portrayed in a Sunday School book by Krummacher. But the corrective was furnished by the author of that 'straminea epistola', as Luther called it. 'Ηλείας ἀνθρώπος ἦν ὁμοιωπάθης ἡμῖν (Ja. 5, 17), and so when it came to the time of philological heroes, I remembered the protest of Barnabas and Paul, a protest one never hears from German scholars: καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁμοιωπάθεις ἐσμεν ὑμῖν ἀνθρώποι. The editorship of the JOURNAL has left me few illusions. Miserable offenders are we all. And in making my obligatory survey of the JOURNAL I have found—not in the lower ranks only but in the highest places—examples enough of sins not to be covered by σφάλματα μημονικά and 'typothetarum errores'. My only standard is TO ON, not Teuton, not Briton. 'Nothing so brutal as a fact' said Ste.-Beuve, and I hate brutality; but τὸ δὲ is τὸ δὲ. In matters of philological accuracy, I am strictly impartial—as impartial as Dido. To me as to every scholar, as to everyone who has pretensions to scholarship, false quantities are an abomination and I should have been shocked, if I had not outlived of late the possibility of being shocked, when an eminent British scholar wrote, 'I cannot approve your laxity about quantities'. I could only parody my favourite poet John Bunyan, 'I such dirt heap never was, since Ritschl disciplined me'. What have I done to deserve such a rebuke? Where shown laxity? Have not the Germans winced at my footnote A. J. P. XXIII 4? The fact is, I am paying the penalty for the reproduction of my youthful essay in which I ridiculed English scholars for making such a parade of their correctness in the matter of quantity. I have called it a negative virtue,¹ but if that is not a fair statement, it is nothing to brag of, and yet English writers, remembering their schooldays and their 'swishings', give one no peace about false quantities as they give us no rest from the perpetual teapot. In SAMUEL BUTLER's *The Way of All Flesh*, confidently pronounced by

¹ A. J. P. XXIX 116.

¹ A. J. P. XXXVII 497.

one judge the greatest of English novels, by another, the greatest novel of the world, we have an exemplification of this tiresome *motif*.

When Ernest spoke inadvertently of the Quirinal, Dr. Skinner replied with his wonted pomp: Yes, the Quirinal or as I myself prefer to call it, Quirinal.

Now Quirinal is the natural pronunciation for anyone who has lodged at the Hotel Quirinale, and I am reminded of an old friend who seriously proposed to accent the English 'orator' and 'auditor' on the penult.

In the Carnegie Endowment edition of GROTIUS' *Mare Liberum* p. 9, l. 11 there is a curious error which in all fairness ought not to be charged, as has been done, to the faulty memory of the illustrious author. In the place cited we find: *Et hoc nomine Hercules Orchomeniorum, Graeci sub Agamemnōne Mysorum regi arma intulerunt, quasi libera essent naturaliter itinera, ut Baldus dixit.* The editor tells us that 'Grotius refers to the Trachiniae of Sophocles, probably from memory, but there is no such reference in the play'. The reference is not to the Trachiniae itself but to an extract from Apollodorus which the Laurentianus has prefixed to the play in lieu of an argument. In this extract (Bibl. II. 7, 7, 4) ὡς δὲ εἰς Ὀρχομενὸν ἤκει, 'Αμύντωρ αὐτὸν ὁ θαυμέστερος οὐκ εἶσει μεθ' ὄπλων παριέναι, κωλυόμενος δὲ παρελθεῖν καὶ τοῦτον ἀπέκτεινεν, the evident correction of Wesselung 'Ορμένιον for 'Ορχομενὸν appears in the Dindorf edition—and *Orchomeniorum* should be *Ormeniorum*. Ormenion was in Thessaly, the scene of the Trachiniae; Orchomenus was in Boeotia, the canton in which Thespiae lies, the scene of Herakles' Thirteenth Labor.

A timely document that same *Mare Liberum* by a professor of law, timely reading for April the second those words of cap. 13: *Quodsi in bellum trudimur hostium iniquitate, debet nobis causae aequitas spem ac fiduciam boni eventus addere.* More than ever may this world-war be called a professors' war (A. J. P. XXXVII 118) and it is interesting to find the recent analysis of the differences between English and German methods of classical study (l. c. 498) reappearing with momentous significance in the language of an eminent academical authority.

The Englishman's ideal is character; the German's ideal is performance. The Englishman desires to be a man among men, governed as far as possible by public opinion. The German desires to be an

efficient part of an efficient organization, helping it to do its work better than any other organization ever did it before. The war is, in fact, a contest between these two types; and the underlying lesson of these awful years is that somehow the virtues of the two types must be conjoined instead of separated. The English type, left to itself, tends to go ahead gallantly and loyally, but unintelligently. The German type, left to itself, tends to gain its immediate objects, intelligently and efficiently, but at the sacrifice of those habits of courtesy and morality which are the very basis of civilization.

Discarding the favorite commercial theory, President Hadley believes that 'this war will establish the principle that character and performance must go hand in hand; that morals and brains must be conjoined; and that a civilization which attempts to base itself on either to the exclusion of the other is fundamentally incomplete'. In other words, there will be a blend of the *ἀρετή* of efficiency (XXXV 367) with the *ἀρετή* of the gentleman. The ideal of philology is the ideal of life.

In his memoirs Jefferson tries to keep young by gibes at old age, and in a letter, recently exhumed, written when he was in his eighty-second year, he begins with the words: 'The weight of years and the wane of mind inseparable from that withdraw me from serious application'. There is a self-satisfied smirk in that apt alliteration 'weight of years' and 'wane of mind'. Now *Brief Mention* can hardly be called 'serious application' so that I keep within Jeffersonian limitations, but the application sometimes takes the form of a blister which I am as ready to apply to myself as to others. Rousseau, it may be remembered, scouts Montaigne's claim that his book is a 'livre de bonne foy' and ridicules his 'fausse naïveté' in ascribing to himself none but amiable weaknesses. But the mistakes of a scholar are never amiable (A. J. P. XXXVII 242) and haunt the transgressor as long as he lives. Among the sins that seem to be purged by confession are typographical errors. They are sins because they shew a lack of vigilance. In the last volume there are two that disturb the sense, A. J. P. XXXVII 110 l. 7 from bottom where for 'divorced' read 'derived' and p. 111 l. 15 for 'dependents' read 'unfriends', 'adversaries', 'opponents' or some equivalent. The MS. reading is irrecoverable. In my attempted version of *εἰτέ τις Ἡράκλειτε* A. J. P. XXXIII 112 the third line should read 'As I recalled how oft we two as one'. The wrong copy was sent to the typewriter. In a notice of Professor LANE COOPER'S *Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature* written when I had no access to works of reference (A. J. P. XXXVII 379), I followed the authority of the Nation in the matter of the familiar quotation from Carlyle as to the relation

of genius and taking pains. There is a catena of such things in Bartlett 10th ed., p. 584—and Carlyle's pronouncement is not the worst. 'Genius means the transcendent capacity for taking trouble',—'means' and not 'is' and Carlyle improves on Buffon.

'Thus bad begins but worse remains behind.' The 'ductor titubantium' of the last number has proved himself a titubant leader of the titubants and Paulus has caused me more sleepless nights than Kleophantis ever caused the Silentary. In the dry light of Baltimore my senses undisturbed by the scent of a marvellous rose-garden, the exotic perfume of Albert Samain's *Au Jardin de l'Infante* (25th ed.), and the *vers libres* and *pensées libres* of Paul Géraldy, I am only too happy that I did not publish more of my metamorphoses and wonder that I called A. P. VI 71 (p. 58), one of my favorites. There is no actuality, no vision about it. Phantom chaplets, phantom cups out of a non-existent past—an absurd dedication. According to one translator, after making a night of it with his boon-companions, the hero of the epigram oftentimes repaired to the dwelling of his obdurate love. But the natural construction of the Greek followed by Veniero gives Paulus the escort of Horace's 'iuvenes protervi'. Merivale, finding them in the way, has left them out altogether. *ὑβριστὴν μῆθον* is involved in *οὐκ ἔτος*. The Bohn version of *μελιχρῆς | ἐλπίδος ὑβριστὴν μῆθον* is 'the saucy language of honey-dripping hope'—a rendering which like the *ἵπ' ἀγκῶνος βέλη* of Pindar *ἔμηνέων χατίζει*. Veniero gives us, 'non mai | dolce speranza brillò nei tuoi superbi detti'. I myself tried, 'No sweet hope | lurking in haughty language', but finally, under the influence of Byzantine *ἔρωμανται* and the last line of Byron's *Don Juan*, I wrote, 'Sweet hope | Of frolic madness', for which Paulus is in no wise responsible. This also is a sin and a sin of the first magnitude. It recalls the grave words of Boeckh, who characterizes a certain style of conjectural emendation as 'Ein frevelhafter Eingriff in die fremde Individualität' and of this sacrilegious encroachment upon another's personality, the critical notes of the Anthology abound.¹

¹ A footnote must atone for a footnote l. c. p. 72. I did not find an opportunity of verifying my impression as to the aorist of *βιεῖν* and it seems strange that I should have forgotten the *βικήσας* of so familiar a passage as Ar. Av. 796. Still according to Concordance and Index to which I had no personal access when the note was written, there is only that one aorist in Aristophanes and an intolerable deal of durative, cursive, paratactic tenses.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(*Apropos of AJPh. 37, 172 sq.*)

As an active contender (*quamvis andabatarum more*) for suffixation out of—but not exclusively out of—composition be it permitted me for the present to make a brief reply to the article of Professor Walter Petersen in *AJPh.* 37. 172 sq. As regards the spread of suffixes by irradiation there is no issue between Petersen and me, but he has taken upon himself the burden of denying, trifling exceptions apart, the possibility that suffixes—through the middle stage that I call *confixes*—have come from *posteriora* of composition. He further denies the availability of the Germanic *confixes* as illustrative of the process. This last proposition is entirely untenable.

In Wright's *Old English Grammar*, § 622, the suffix *-bære* (: “Lat. *fer* in *lucifer* ‘light-bearing’; originally a verbal adjective from *beran* ‘to bear’”) is documented by the following list of words and definitions, to which I have added approximate Latin synonyms :

appel-bære ‘apple-bearing’ (*mālosus, malifer; pomosus, pomifer); *ator-bo* ‘poisonous’ (venenosus, venenifer); *cwealm-bo* ‘deadly’ (exitiosus, mortifer); *fefer-bo* ‘winged’ (plumosus, plumifer); *fyr-bo* ‘fiery’ (flammosus, flammifer); *gram-bo* ‘passionate’ (furiosus); *hal-bo* ‘wholesome’ (—, salutifer); *horn-bo* ‘horned’ (*cornuosus, cornifer); *lēoht-bo* ‘bright, splendid’ (luminosus); *lust-bo* ‘desirable’ (quasi voluptuosus); *mann-bo* ‘producing men’ (quasi virosus); *tungol-bo* ‘starry’ (*stellosus, stellifer); *wāstm-bo* ‘fruitful’ (fructuosus); *wig-bo* ‘warlike’ (bellosus).

With these Old English words before us, my contention is that, if we did not indisputably know the force and derivation of *obære* and should agree to treat it as if it were a proethnic wordend, the greater number of active contemporary grammarians would declare *-bære* a suffix so generalized as not to be susceptible to etymological interpretation, while Professor Petersen would have to go further and declare it impossible to conceive of “IE.” *-bære* ever having been a *posteriori*.

By my Latin renderings in *-ōsus* I wish to call attention to Nichols's *Yale dissertation* (1914) on *Semantic Variability*. For *-ōsus* he sets down as many as 31 contextual nuances. Given a wide literary documentation for the OEng. adjectives

in *-bāre*, no doubt as fissipant nuances might, with some finesse, be translated into them. If we hearken to Wright's renderings, only two define *-bāre*, and ten several suffixes are displayed in his other definitions. A wider variability could hardly be desired even by one who would teach that suffixes could never have meant anything in particular. Yet any English scholar, confronted with this list, would probably feel the sense of 'bearing' in them all, for they are still clear and not obfuscated (*verdunkelte*) compounds. But all that is needed for their complete obfuscation is to transpose them, for the sake of argument, to the proethnic speech.

And the exhibit for *-bāre* is not isolated. Consider also the OEng. adjectives in *-fāst* (Wright, § 627), which I shall present with scant comment, chiefly by way of spacing:

"*-fāst*, same word (sic) as the adj. *fāst* 'fast, fixed, firm'. As *ārend-fāst* 'bound on an errand'; *ārfa-* 'virtuous'; *bidfo* 'stationary'; *blād-fo* 'glorious'; *eorpyo* 'fixed in the earth'; *gieffo* 'gifted'; *hogfo* 'prudent'; *husfo* 'having a home'; *hygefō* 'wise'; *mægenfo* 'vigorous'; *sigefō* 'victorious'; *stedefō* 'stead fast'; *treowfo* 'faithful'!"

Of course we might render *ārfāst* and the rest by 'firm in honor', etc., and so maintain the actual sense of the posterius in each of the compounds, but Wright's renderings show that, judged through the medium of English definition, *-fāst* appears as truly a suffix as *-mant/vant* in the Sanskrit "possessives". Translation, it must not be forgotten, displays a vagueness and variety in the meaning of posteriora, confixes or suffixes, far in excess of their inherent vagueness or variability. For derivation, as well as for syntax, we must guard against being misled by the very finesse of our own renderings.

Not only in such larger groups of words are undeniable posteriora substantially as vague and variable as suffixes but, in proportion to their range, individual compounds reveal as wide a variability. Thus I noted in TAPA 44, 125 that Skr. *go-sakhi-*, literally 'cow-friend', but in one of its two occurrences=mixed with milk, is precisely equivalent to the "possessive" *go-mant* (see also Nichols, op. cit., 7 fn.). According to the current view,¹ Greek *ἀνδρά-ποδα* 'captives in war' is a definite irradiation, at only one remove, from *τετρά-ποδα*, in which case *-ποδα* never meant anything at all and 'captive'

¹ I would rather explain *ποδίτε* 'ties by the foot' from *ποδί* (loc.) + *τε*: Skr. *dyāti* 'ties'; and *ἀνδρά-ποδίτε* (by back formation *ἀνδρά-ποδα*) as 'man-hobbles', cf. Eng. *hog-ties*. Pending a fuller treatment of the Homeric verb in *-τε*, Professor Petersen will, I hope, be indulgent if I further analyze *ποτί-τε* 'gives to drink' (so L. and Sc.; quasi *biberdat*) as containing an infinitive **ποτε* (cf. O Bulg. *pi-ti* 'bibere', Av. *rāiti* 'dare', *siti* 'habitare') + **dyeti* 'dat' (cf. AJPh. 37, 171, 29a).

was, as in *τετρά-ποδα* (!), a pure connotation. In *όρχι-πέδα* 'testiculi' (: ὄρχις 'testiculus') and in *λακκό-πέδον* 'scrotum' who can doubt that *-πέδον* is a posterius, but who can certainly define it?¹ In *ἀγχίμολον* 'prope' <prope-iens (cf. L. Meyer, Hdbch., IV, 433) the posterius is almost reduced to a semantic zero. The fact that *-sakhi -ποδα -πέδον -μολον* did not spread by irradiation and so became suffixal is a mere accident. Semantically each of these posteriora is, within its range, as vague or variable as any suffix. In his Celtic Grammar (§ 362) Pedersen gives a list of twelve obfuscated posteriora; cf. also O'Connell's Old Irish Grammar, p. 40 (d).

Semantic variability and vagueness are not limited to word-ends. In no suffix has semantic variability gone farther than in the German word *zug*. In typical instances like *nova res* 'novelty' and *timidus animus* 'timidity' all the significance of *res* and *animus* can be obfuscated by translation.

In certain Greek periphrastic turns *βίη ἵσ κῆρ μένος* (v. exx. ap. Seymour, Homeric Language, p. 21) are like the smile of Alice's vanishing Cheshire cat. Priora are also obfuscated (IF, 26, p. 33); and in the average use of our English words *alone* *alone*, or even *welcome*, neither priora nor posteriora ever rise to consciousness.

By disregarding the distinction between primary and secondary derivatives Professor Petersen darkens counsel. It is mere sophiscation to impugn the semantic content of the larger suffixes because the suffixes *e/o i u* lack content. In truth, these declension exponents are mere deictics, *i* and *u* certainly identical with localia and *e/o* with instrumental and locative (cf. AJPh. 37, 167²; 170, § 28) and vocative exponents. This *e* meant 'there' (*là da*). For its vocative potency note a cry like English *you there*, varying with *there you*. Lat. *puer-e* is quasi 'garçon, là!', cf. the imperative *παῦ-ε* 'halte-là'.

Into Petersen's abstract and general arguments I shall not now further go. By way of antidote, for I also have my oracles,² readers might do well to consult Rozwadowski's *Wortbildung und Wortbedeutung* wherein it is ably contended that, psychologically considered, all noun suffixes must be regarded as confixes or posteriora; and even that, conceptually, every root noun is bipartite. R. expressly chronicles the multiple origin of *-er* in German nouns.

In his able dissertation on the *-ιον* diminutives in Greek Professor Petersen failed to score at least one neat point by

¹ If I am right in the belief that *πέδη* 'fetter' is from **πέδο-δη* 'foot-binder' (cf. *πέ[δο]-διλον* 'sandal' with *i* <*ει*), *-πέδον* may have meant 'binder' > 'bag'.

² I allude to the famous scene in the Knights of Aristophanes.

not perpending composition for the early words in *-διος*. For διχθά-διος we should certainly adduce διχθὰ δεδαίται (a 23) and at least tentatively propose the definition 'bi-pertitus'. The independence of the adverb μιννθά 'paulum temporis' should also lead to the analysis of μιννθά-διος 'short-lived', even if we cannot decide between (1) *-διος*: Av. *gaya-* 'life' and (2) *-διος*: IE. *DĀI* 'dividere', as found in Eng. *ti-me ti-de*. Pending a subsequent essay on *-διος* and the other *d* suffixes, I now premise that they are derivable from (1) *Dō* 'dare' (cf. κομ-δή with Lat. *operam dare*), (2) *DĀI* 'dividere, partire' (3) *DĒI* 'vincere', (4) *gwi-* 'vivere' (Greek only). We are certainly to proceed from (3) *DĒI* in words like ἀψί-δ- 'mesh' and in names of apparel like κνημῆ-δ- 'greave', wherein δ is the weak-case stem-form of a root noun *DĒ* or *D-Ā* (cf. on πέδη above). The movable δ of Greek noun flexion originated from the interplay between pairs like *ἀψί-*s*/tautological ἀψί-δ-, and acc. κνάμιν 'knee' (i. e. knee-covering, greave; cf. Eng. *leg* of trousers) interchanging with κνάμι-δ-*a* 'knee-binding' > 'greave'; cf. Skr. *r̥cya-dá*¹ lit. 'antelope-binder' > 'pit for trapping elephants'. PW² also explains from the root *dēi* the adj. *-di-s* in *sadām-di-s* "für immer fesselnd,—bleibend,—dauernd" (cf. *sada-dís* 'gewöhnlich'). This certainly gives us a clue to ἀ-διος (Hom. *hymn*) 'ever-lasting' and, with slight irradiation, to Hom. κορπέδιος 'juvenalis'. But in all these cases, as well as in μιννθάδιος above, *-διος* may be referred to the sept of Eng. *time tide*: Skr. *dī-na-m*, day.²

With these three, or in Greek four, sources for *-d-* compounds the conditions were particularly favorable for vagueness in the eventual *d*-suffix. In Latin, we have *d* <*dh*, also. And much ought to be made of this fact. Prellwitz unnecessarily limited himself in his explanation of IE. (animal) names in *-bhos* to the sense of 'appearance, color'. But in the onomatopoetics in *-bhos* (see list, including *dundu-bhis* 'drum' and *φλῆρα-φος* 'prattling', in Brugmann, Gr. 2, I, 390) the sense of 'calling, speaking' is self-suggestive. In words like κόλα-φος 'fist-blow', κρότα-φος 'temple' (a 'throbbing') a believer in composition would look for a posterius cognate with O Bulg. *biti* 'ferire', and believe that the vagueness of the suffix *-bho* came from the fact that the original posterius *-bho* meant such different things as (1) color (2) calling (3) striking—but (2) may have come from (3).

¹ It is curious to contrast the hesitant analysis of Skr. *añga-da-m*, arm-band, in PW¹, with the confident explanation of *r̥cya-dá* in PW².

² Further note (2) *DĒI* (to whirl, dance, rush), in the sept of *διος*, δειμαι—perhaps in *ἀντί-διος*, which would then have meant 'facile vertens' at first; and (3) *DĒI* (to shine, show), in the kin of *δέαται*, and perhaps to be recognized in Homeric ἀμφά-διος × κρυπτά-διος. But the problem of ἀμφά-διος is complicated with the problem of ἐκ-τάδ-ιος (-τάδ-: Lat. *tend-it*).

At any time in the history of IE. speech or of any of its derivative tongues during the existence of the sept of Lat. *fāri* 'to speak' an onomatopoetic like κουκού-φας cuckoo (?) would have been inevitably analyzed as *cuccu-fans, an analysis that would have greatly facilitated the extension, under proper chronological conditions, of a *bh* suffix to bird names. Or, if κουκούφα-ς is onomatopoetic through all its syllables, the root of *fā-ri* might even have been abstracted from it.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Nov. 18, 1916.

NOTE ON ARISTOPHANES AVES 1313.

In Ar. Av. 1313-14,

ταχὺ δὴ πολυάνορα τάνδε πόλιν
καλεῖ τις ἀνθρώπων,

Porson reads δὴ; the codices, δ' ἀν; G. Hermann (retaining πτερῶν in the antistrophe 1325), τὰν.

The MSS offer an example of ἀν + fut.; AN and ΔH are not infrequently interchanged, we are told,¹ but Porson's (on Eur. Hec. 1161) δὴ does not account for δ' unless it is the result of an early correction. One may recall however Xen. Cyn. 13. 7, ῥέδιον γὰρ ἔσται αὐτοῖς ταχὺ μὴ ὄρθως μέμφασθαι, and the emendation of G. Kaibel (Hermes XXV, 591 anm.), who suggested τὰ χύδην (scil. γεγραμένα). A similar reading of the MSS in the Aristophanes passage is, I think, indicated,

τὰ χύδαν πολυάνορα τάνδε πόλιν
καλεῖ τις ἀνθρώπων,

your 'populous Pall Mall'—probably a comic allusion to a phrase of the day.

HENRY N. SANDERS.

BRYN MAWR, PA.

¹ S. C. G. 432 footn.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Anderson (Mabel Louise). A Study of Virgil's descriptions of nature. Boston, *Badger*, 1916. 224 pp., tabs., \$1.25 net.

Carpenter (Rhys). The Ethics of Euripides. London, *Milford*, 1917. Cr. 4to. 10 x 6½, 48 pp., swd. (Archives of Philosophy.)

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). Selected orations and letters; with introd., notes, vocabulary and English-Latin exercises by Arthur W. Roberts and J. C. Rolfe. N. Y., *Scribner*, 1916. \$1.50.

Dutton (Emily Helen). Studies in Greek prepositional phrases. University of Chicago diss. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Libraries*, 1917. 8°, v-ix, 211 pp., pa. \$1.00.

Epictetus. Discourses and Manual, together with Fragments of his writings. Tr. w. intro. and notes by P. E. Matheson. (Oxford Translations.) Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1917. 2 vols., 8°, pp. 246 + 280, ea. 3s. 6d. net.

Gaselee (Stephen). The Greek manuscripts in the Old Seraglio at Constantinople. N. Y., *Putnam*, 1916. 14 p. O. pap. 30 cents net.

Harris (J. Rendel). The Ascent of Olympus. London, *Longmans*, 1917. Fol. 10¾ x 6¾, 140 pp. 5s. net.

Mendell (Clarence Whittlesey). Latin sentence connection. *Yale Univ. Press*, 1917. O x + 214 pp. \$1.50.

Meredith (Clement Orestes). Partes orationis as discussed by Virgilii Maro Grammaticus, with some observations upon his inflection and syntax. (Johns Hopkins diss.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1916. O 9 + 75 pp. 50 cents.

Plotinus. An Essay on the Beautiful. Tr. by Thomas Taylor. London, *Watkins*, 1917. Cr. 8vo., bds., 1s. 6d. net.

Preston (Keith). Studies in the diction of the sermo amatorius in Roman comedy. (Un. of Chicago diss.) Chicago, *Un. of Chicago Libraries*, 1916. 8°, 67 pp. 50 cents.

Walton (Frederick Parker). Hist. intro. to the Roman law. London, *W. Green*, 1917. 8vo. 9 x 5¾, 408 pp., 12s. net.

Weatherhead (T. C.). First rules for Latin prose, with hints and examples. London, *Cambr. Univ. Press*, 1917. Ryl. 8vo. 9½ x 6½ (folded card), 8d. net.

Weekley (Ernest). Surnames. N. Y., *Dutton*, 1916. 22 + 364 pp. (4½ p. bibl.) D. \$2.25 net.

FRENCH.

Dautemer (Joseph). Le Premier livre de japonais. Langue parlée, Grammaire, Exercices, Dialogues. Paris, *Garnier Frères*, 1917. In-18, cart., 3 fr. 50.

Ducros (Louis). Jean-Jacques Rousseau, De Montmorency au Val-de-Travers (1757-1765). Paris, *Fontemoing*, 1917. In-8, 10 fr.

— Jean-Jacques Rousseau, De Genève à l'Hermitage (1712-1757). Paris, *Fontemoing* (E. deBoccard), 1917. In-8, 10 fr.

Lectures russes. Accentuées, éditées sous la direction d'Olga Klionoff, 1re série, no. 1. Contes choisis de Tourguenoff (Récits d'un Chasseur). Paris, *L. Rodstein*, 1917. In-8, 75 cent.

Marchand (Chas. M.) A careful selection of modern Parisian slang including the new "Argot des tranchées" with explanatory notes. Paris, *Terquem*, 1916. In-16, cart., 3 fr.

Vekovitch (Mlle. D.) Manuel de conversation serbe-français. Paris, *Rodstein*, 1917. In-12, 3 fr. 50.

ITALIAN.

Bertoni (G.) Italia dialettale. (Manuali Hoepli.) Milano, *Hoepli*, 1916. 16°, p. viii, 240. L. 3.50.

Ermini (Filippo). La Stabat Mater e i pianti della Vergine nella lirica del medio evo; ricerche e studi. Città di Castello, 1916. 8°, p. 153. L. 3.

Livi (Enrico). Nuova grammatica della lingua latina (morfologia e sintassi). Firenze, 1916. 16°, p. viii, 366. L. 2.50.

Lung-Castely (A.) Metodo razionale di ortografia e grammatica francese. Torino, 1916. 8°, p. 158. L. 2.25.

Piccio (Giuseppe). Dizionario veneziano-italiano. Venezia, 1916. 16°, p. 149. L. 2.

SPANISH.

Alemany y Bolufer (José). Diccionario de la lengua Española. Esta obra consta de 120,000 artículos y contiene todas las voces de la 14.a edición del Diccionario de la Academia y unas 40,000 más, sancionadas por el uso y por la autoridad de buenos hablistas entre las que se encuentran más de 25,000 americanismos y numerosos vocablos técnicos. Lleva además, como apéndice de verdadera utilidad, los principales paradigmas de los verbos españoles y la lista de estos, con expresión del modelo a que su conjugación se ajustan; un volumen en 4.º mayor de 1,746 págs. encuadrado en tela. Madrid, *Fé*, 1916. 10 pesetas.

Boue (Wilfredo). Mecanismo de los verbos castellanos conforme a la gramática de la Real Academia Española; un vol. en 8.º mayor de 76 págs. encartado. Madrid, *Fé*, 1916. 3.50 pesetas.

Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europea Americana. Etimologías, sanscrito, hebreo, griego, latín, árabe, lenguas indígenas, americanas, etc. Versión de la mayoría de las voces en francés, italiano, inglés, alemán, portugués, catalán y esperanto. Tomo XXX. Madrid, *Romo*, 1916. 26,50 pesetas.

Meneu (Pascual). Discurso leído en la inauguración del curso académico de 1916 a 1917 en la Universidad de Salamanca; un folleto en 4.º de 40 págs. Madrid, *Fé*, 1916. 2 pesetas.

Sánchez (Juan M.) Las cuatro primeras ediciones de los escritos de Santa Teresa; un folleto en 4.º de 15 págs. Madrid, *Fé*, 1916.

Velázquez De La Cadena (Mariano). Diccionario de las lenguas española e inglesa compuesto sobre los diccionarios de la Academia Española, Terreros, Salvá y el de Baretty y Neuman, publicados por el Dr. Seoane, y los ingleses de Webster, Worcester y Walker, aumentado con más de ocho mil palabras, idiotismos y frases familiares; enriquecido con las irregularidades de los verbos y la sinopsis de ambas lenguas y adicionado con un suplemento de términos marítimos, tercera edición; dos vols. en 4.º de 927 págs. el 1.º y 833 el 2.º, encuadrados en tela. Madrid, *Fé*, 1916. 20 pesetas.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Αθηνᾶ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικό τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπιστημονικῆς ἀκαδημαίας. Τόμος εικοστὸς δύοδος. Τεύχος α', β', γ', δ'. Ἀθηνῆσσι, 1916.

Athenaeum. Studii periodici di letteratura e storia. Direttore Carlo Pascal. Anno V, fasc. 1, gennaio 1917. Pavia, *Athenaeum*.

Blake (Frank R.) The Tagalog Verb. (Reprint from the Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 36, pp. 396-414.) New Haven, Conn., *American Oriental Society*, 1917.

Bureau of American Ethnology. Thirty-first annual report, 1909-1910. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1916.

Chase (George H.) Catalogue of Arretine pottery. Boston and New York, *Houghton Mifflin Co.*, 1916. \$2.50.

Dresser (Horatio W.) Handbook of The New Thought. New York and London, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1917. \$1.25.

Dutton (Emily Helen). Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases. διά, διπό, ἀπ, ἀπό, ἐπ. (Chicago diss.) Private edition distributed by University of Chicago Libraries, 1916.

Gildersleeve (Basil L.) Paulus Silentiarius. Reprint from the American Journal of Philology, vol. XXXVIII, 1, 1917.

Hancock (John Leonard). Studies in stichomythia. Chicago diss. Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*. 75 cents.

Johnson (Edwin Lee). Historical Grammar of the Ancient Persian Language. The Vanderbilt Oriental Series. Ed. by Herbert Cushing Tolman and James Henry Stevenson. New York, *American Book Co.*, (1917).

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXXVI, Part II, 1916.

Kretzmann (Paul Edward). The Liturgical Element in the Earliest Forms of the Medieval Drama with special reference to the English and German plays. The University of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature, No. 4. Minneapolis, *Bulletin of the University of Minnesota*, 1916. \$1.00.

Long (George), The Letters of. Edited by Thomas Fitzhugh. University of Virginia, *The Library*, 1917.

MacCurdy (Dr. John T.) A Clinical Study of Epileptic Deterioration. Psychiatric Bulletin. Utica, N. Y., *State Hospital Press*.

Magoun (H. W.) A Lacuna in Scholarship. (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., 1917.)

Mayūra, The Sanskrit poems of. Edited with a translation and notes and an introduction together with the text and translation of Bāṇa's Candisataka by George Payn Quackenbos. (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series. Vol. 9.) New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1917. \$1.50.

Meillet (A.) Caractères généraux des langues germaniques. Paris, *Librairie Hachette et Cie*, 1917. 3 fr. 50.

Mnemosyne. *Bibliotheca philologica Batava. Nova Series*. Vol. XLV. Partes I et II. Lugduni-Batavorum, *E. J. Brill*, 1917.

North Carolina, University of. Studies in Philology. Vol. XIV, Number 1. January, 1917. Chapel Hill, *The University of North Carolina*.

Northup (Clark Sutherland). A bibliography of Thomas Gray. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1917. \$3.00.

Oxford English Dictionary. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, Henry Bradley, etc. Vol. IX. Si-Th. SULLEN-SUPPLE. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1917. 85 cents.

Pease (A. S.) Notes on the Delphic Oracle and Greek Colonization. Reprint from *Classical Philology*, Jan., 1917.

Rand (E. K.) Charles Pomeroy Parker. Reprint from *The Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, March, 1917.

Rivista indo-greco-italica di filologia, lingua, antichità. Periodico trimestrale diretto da Francesco Ribezzo. Anno I. Fascicolo I. Napoli, Giuseppe Marino, Napoli. Abbonamento per l'estero Lire 18.

Robinson (David M.) The Modern Versions of the Harmodius Hymn. *Classical Weekly*, March 5, 1917.

Smith (Kirby Flower). Propertius: A Modern Lover in the Augustan Age. *Sewanee Review*, January, 1917.

Society of Biblical Archaeology, Proceedings. Vol. XXXIX. Parts 1 and 2. 47th Session. January and February meetings. London, *At the Offices of the Society*, 1917.

Steadman (J. M., Jr.) The Origin of the Historical Present in English. Studies in Philology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Jan., 1917.

Thayer (Mary Rebecca). The influence of Horace on the chief English poets of the nineteenth century. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1916. Cornell Studies in English II. \$1.00.

Tieje (Arthur Jerrold). The Theory of Characterization in Prose Fiction prior to 1740. The University of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature, Number 5. Minneapolis, *Bulletin of the University of Minnesota*, 1916. 75 cents.

Van Hoesen (H. B.) Rediscovery of a Saibante Papyrus. Reprinted from The American Library Institute, Atlantic City Meeting, 1916. Princeton, N. J., 1917.

Wulff (K.) Den oldjavanske Wirâtaparwa og dens sanskrit-original. Bidrag til Mahâbhârata—forskningen. København, *Emil Wiene's Boghandel*, 1917.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, 3.

WHOLE NO. 151.

I.—THE PLOT OF THE EPIDICUS.

The plot of the *Epidicus* has long been a puzzle to scholars. Joseph Scaliger, in 1558, was the first to note difficulties in the play and the problem was touched upon in 1913 by Friedrich Leo.¹ Between these two extremes lies the work of a long line of scholars, but the most important contributions have been made since the time of Ladewig (1841). All the more serious difficulties are probably known, but it is only within the last twenty-five years that solutions have been proposed which may be taken as the basis of a fresh examination of the whole problem. By criticizing and extending the work already accomplished and by bringing to bear upon it some new points of view it is now possible, in my opinion, to formulate a more acceptable result than has hitherto been attained.

The plot is so complicated that a careful outline is necessary. The exposition consists of three scenes (vv. 1-180) the first of which is a dialogue between Epidicus and Thesprio, slaves from an Athenian household. Thesprio has just returned with his young master Stratippocles from the army which has been besieging Thebes. At his departure from Athens Stratippocles had commissioned Epidicus to secure for him a certain Acropolitis with whom at the time he was in love. Epidicus had accomplished this by persuading the young man's father to buy the girl in the belief that she was his long lost daughter (87-90). But Epidicus now learns from Thesprio that the fickle youth has fallen in love with a Theban captive—

¹ *Gesch. der röm. Litt.*, p. 133. For Scaliger's remarks see p. 246, n. 2.
16

quot illic homo animos habet? he exclaims in dismay. But Thesprio has more unpleasant news: that Stratippocles has borrowed the money (40 minae) with which to purchase his new flame from a money-lender at Thebes who is following him to Athens to collect the debt and hand over the girl. Ut ego interii basilice! is the cry of Epidicus, who forecasts the damage to his skin when his old master Periphanes discovers the first trick.

In the second scene Stratippocles appears with his friend Chaeribus at whose house he is stopping in order to keep out of his father's sight until he can complete the purchase of his latest sweetheart. Like most young men in the plays Chaeribus is 'broke' and quite unable to provide his friend with the necessary money. And so perforce they fall back on the wily resourcefulness of Epidicus. At this point the slave, who has been eavesdropping in the conventional manner, steps forward and, after some reproaches to his master and the usual threats on the latter's part, promises to cheat Periphanes (a second time) out of enough money to purchase the captive girl, if Stratippocles will keep out of his father's sight. He hints that Acropolitis, the pseudo-daughter of Periphanes and former love of Stratippocles, can be disposed of to a certain Euboicus miles (153).

The third scene introduces Periphanes and his old friend Apocedes. From the conversation of the old gentlemen we learn that Periphanes, whose wife is dead, contemplates marriage with a poor woman of good birth who had borne him a daughter—the very daughter whom he thinks he has purchased in the person of Acropolitis. Neither the mother nor the daughter are named at this point, but the old man is planning to marry off his son as soon as the latter returns, for he has heard that the youth in amore haerere apud nescioquam fidicinam. At about this point the action begins.

Epidicus overhears the old man's intentions concerning his son and makes it the basis of his trickery. He advises Periphanes—after much apparent diffidence at his own presumption in giving such advice!—to marry off Stratippocles and (as a preliminary) to purchase the youth's fidicina and sell her out of the lover's reach before he returns from Thebes. This proposal jumps with the old man's humor, for he does

not know that his son is already in Athens and that he himself has already purchased and has in his house his son's (former) sweetheart Acropolitis. Epidicus suggests that the purchase will be a good investment since a *miles Rhodius* (300) is dead in love with the girl and will take her off the old man's hands at an advanced price. It is arranged that Periphanes, to avoid arousing his son's suspicions, shall keep in the background, and that Epidicus and Apoecides (the latter to guarantee good faith) shall transact the bargain with the girl's master, the *leno*. Apoecides accordingly departs for the forum, Periphanes goes into his house for the money, and Epidicus (306 ff.), who must of course produce some girl to play the part of the supposed sweetheart, states that he will hire a fidicina and coach her (*praemonstrabitur*) how to fool Apoecides. Apparently, although this is not here stated, the girl is to submit to a sham purchase.

Thus Epidicus secures the money which he hands over at once to Stratippocles for the purchase of the Theban captive, with the characteristic trickster's remark, *Dum tibi ego placeam atque obsequar, meum tergum flocci facio!* He then professes to tell his plan to the young men, but it is safe to say that not even an intelligent audience, to say nothing of the rough crowd that viewed the plays in the second century before Christ, could understand this plan as it appears in our text (353-377). I shall return to this point later.

In the next scene (382 ff.) Apoecides brings from the forum the supposed sweetheart whom he thinks he has bought, but who has in reality been hired by Epidicus. She is the third young woman in the play and we shall call her the hired fidicina, since no name is given to her in our manuscripts. Apoecides had not seen the *leno* and (of course!) had not witnessed the transfer of any money, but he had heard Epidicus talk with the girl and he is full of compliments for the slave's cleverness (414 ff.) in making her believe herself hired to play at a sacrifice, not bought. The audience of course assumes in accordance with Epidicus's plan that she is acting in collusion with the trickster. It is therefore a good deal of a jolt when in the following scenes (475 ff.)—the beginning of the dénouement—both her words and actions absolutely contradict this assumption. The soldier appears with the intention of buying from

Periphanes the girl for whose favor he and Stratippocles had been rivals (really, of course, Acropolistis, the pseudo-daughter). When the hired fidicina is produced, whom the soldier indignantly rejects, she proves that she sincerely thought herself merely hired to play at a sacrifice for a senex whom she does not even know by name! The audience, therefore, must make a new assumption: that she too has been fooled by Epidicus.

But still more confusion is in store for Periphanes. No sooner has he driven away in a rage the hired fidicina than his own early flame Philippa arrives searching for her daughter (and his). In this scene (526 ff., the *ἀναγνώσις*) and the following (570 ff.) we learn at last important facts of the old man's previous life—facts which belong to the preliminary history of the play: that he had loved Philippa in Epidaurus, that Telestis, their daughter whose name is now given, was born in Thebes, that he had never seen the girl since her early childhood, that Epidicus however had been in Thebes more recently, and that on Epidicus's authority he had learned that she was a captive and had, as he supposed, bought her. But when, to console the grief-stricken mother, he calls from the house this daughter (really pseudo-daughter Acropolistis) and when Philippa indignantly rejects her, his anger though pathetic is certainly comic (581 ff.):

Quid? ego lenocinium facio qui habeam alienas domi
Atque argentum egurgitem domo prosum? etc.

Acropolistis is amusingly impudent, but she makes a clean breast of everything and lays the blame where it belongs—on Epidicus. Thus the first trick—the trick which had been already accomplished when the play opened—is revealed.

Little more remains. The old men buy straps and set out to find Epidicus, but that worthy saves himself by 'recognizing' in his young master's latest love (the captive girl), Telestis, his old master's daughter—not a very valuable service since the discovery is inevitable. The ecstasy of Stratippocles is of course short-lived, and he says resignedly (652),

Perdidisti et repperisti me, soror,
to which the unfeeling slave rejoins

Stultus: tace.

Tibi quidem quod ames domi praestost—fidicina—opera mea,

a suggestion that the young man may transfer his affections back to Acropolitis!

The play ends with the pardon and manumission of Epidicus, both richly undeserved, and the result is well summed up in the line,

Hic is homost qui libertatem malitia invenit sua.

One who has had the patience to follow the preceding outline will realize the extremely involved nature of the plot. But the plot is not merely involved; it is full of difficulties and obscurities even for the most superficial reader. To these more or less obvious difficulties careful study has of course added many more which are not so obvious. I shall first attempt to state and, so far as possible, classify these difficulties.

The main problem will be simplified by eliminating in the first place a number of defects which may be regarded as of no importance. In v. 14 Thesprio is represented as returning home by way of the *portus*, but in vv. 217, 221—where, to be sure, Epidicus is lying—the soldiers including Stratippocles are returning by way of the *porta*. It is easy to alter the text of v. 14 (so Ussing, Goetz) and the conjecture is attractive because in v. 217, where only *portam* is possible, the manuscripts have both *portam* and *portum*. But the contradiction may be attributed with equal probability to Plautine carelessness¹ and the tendency of recent editors is to leave the text unchanged, cf. Leo, Goetz-Schoell, Lindsay, Goetz.

The passages alluding to the sums of money paid for the slave girls are not consistent (53 f., 122, 141–142, 252, 347, 366, 406 ff., 467, 646 f., 703). Two girls were purchased, Acropolitis and Telestis, and we should regard the inconsistency as of no importance² if vv. 363–370 did not indicate that the sums ought to agree.³ The price of Acropolitis is stated by Peri-

¹ Langrehr (*Miscellanea philologa*, 1876, p. 17) noted that in the Amph. Plautus makes Thebes a seaport! Langen (*Plautin. Studien*, 1886, p. 138) remarks that the Greek model may have had no specific word at this point.

² This is the general view, cf. Langrehr, *op. cit.*, p. 16, Langen, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

³ Ladewig (*Zeitschr. f. die Alt.*, 1841, col. 1089) notes several of these discrepancies and cites Taubmann who believed that in v. 366 Epid. is

phanes (the highest authority!) as 30 minae (703) and Epidicus agrees, but at v. 366 her value is 50 minae. The Theban captive (Telestis) cost Stratippocles 40 minae (53 f.) together with interest at the rate of a nummus per diem per minam. The interest is later merely alluded to in general terms (252, 296, 306) or entirely forgotten (122, 141 f., 296 ad quadraginta, 646, 708), and Epidicus actually secures 50 minae (347, 467). But the arithmetic of Plautus is usually very bad.

At v. 107 Stratippocles has told Chaeribus that the captiva (Telestis) is genere prognatam bono. Langrehr argued that since Stratippocles knew the girl to be of good birth, he must have known her to be his sister. Schredinger and Langen denied this (rightly), and in his later work Langrehr so far receded from his view as to say that at least the poet ought to tell us how Stratippocles got his knowledge of the girl's birth. On this we may remark that the youth may have known her good birth, her true name, and even her father's name without suspecting that she was related to him, since Periphanes had naturally concealed the whole affair from him, cf. 166 ff. The point is not a serious one in the Latin play, but the passage has some bearing on the nature of the Greek original (see p. 249).

Periphanes and Apocedes do not seem to notice or even to be aware of the bustle caused by the return of the soldiers from Thebes (208 ff.). Langen¹ finds difficulty in this, since they know that Stratippocles is with the army. It is however an unimportant detail.

Langen¹ suspects *retractatio* in the long passage on woman's dress (225 ff.). *Retractatio* has not been proved, in my opinion, and at any rate the passage has no bearing on the difficulties of the plot.

Like every other play of Plautus the Epidicus is often repetitious and numerous passages have been suspected by various scholars on this account. The tendency of recent Plautine scholarship is to abandon such criticism. A good illustration of

merely boasting and that in vv. 364 ff. he plans to go to the leno and instruct him to say that *to-day* he has received 50 minae so that the sum will tally with that just given to Epid., if the old men question the leno.

¹ Plaut. Stud., p. 144.

the changed attitude may be found by comparing Goetz's *Ditto-graphien im Plautustexte* (1875) and the same scholar's major edition of the *Epidicus* (1878) with the minor edition of Goetz-Schoell (1895) and the second edition of the *Epidicus* (1902). After twenty-five years Goetz admits the genuineness of nearly all the passages which he formerly suspected. Leo (1895) and Lindsay (1905) also bracket very few passages.¹ The suspected passages which affect the plot will be considered at the proper places.

But there are serious difficulties. Among these I shall include some which, although unimportant in themselves, nevertheless may have some bearing on the more important.

When the play opens Periphanes has already been tricked by Epidicus into the purchase of *Acropolitis* (his son's *amica*) in the belief that she is his daughter. How was the old man persuaded that she was his daughter? This question is not answered by the expository portion of the play and remains unanswered until vv. 564-566 from which we learn that Epidicus had told Periphanes that his daughter had been captured and was in Athens, and vv. 635 ff., from which we assume that Epidicus had been in Thebes recently enough to be able to recognize Telestis.

Periphanes planned to marry Philippa (166 ff.), but there is no further reference to this important feature of the plot—not even when Philippa and Periphanes meet and recognize each other (526 ff.).² Before this scene we do not know that Periphanes had ever been in Thebes or Epidaurus, and the only information vouchsafed by the poet concerning the old man's past life is that he had a daughter by a poor woman of good birth and that he believes himself to have purchased that daughter through the agency of Epidicus.

¹ Goetz-Schoell marks as *retractatio* vv. 431-434, and as interpolated vv. 109-111, 353 (but cf. Leo's punctuation), 384 f. (in part), 419, 518-520. Goetz (1902) marks as *retract.* vv. 431-434, and as *interpol.* 353, 384 f. (in part), 419. Leo brackets 385, 393, 518-520. Lindsay brackets 384 f. (in part), 419.

² Ladewig first called attention to this omission (*op. cit.*, col. 1086 f.), adding that the gifts taken to Telestis by Epidicus (639-640) were probably sent by Periphanes and that the slave's lie about her capture roused the old man's memories of Philippa. The verb *afferre* (639) lends some support to the first suggestion.

A marriage is being planned for Stratippocles in the early part of the play (190, 267, 283, 361), but there is no reference to it later,¹ indeed the only reference to the young man's future is Epidicus's hint (653) that he may console himself for the loss of Telestis by returning to Acropolistis, his discarded flame.

The allusions to the *leno* cause difficulties (274 f., 288 f., 294 f., 364-370, 410-421, 445-501). In accordance with the first three passages Apoecides and Epidicus are to go to the *leno* and purchase the *fidicina* whom, as Epidicus falsely asserts, Stratippocles loves. The *leno* is apparently the same from whom Acropolistis had been purchased two days before, for this is implied by Epidicus (364-370) who intends to deceive him into making a statement to the old men (should they approach him after the transaction)² which will be taken by them as a guarantee that he has just received 50 *minae* for the *fidicina*, whereas he himself means the money which he received two days earlier for Acropolistis. But the plan, whatever its exact nature, was not carried out,³ for the accounts of Apoecides (410-421) and of the *fidicina* (495-501, cf. 486-487) show that Apoecides did not see⁴ the *leno* at all and there is no reference to an interrogation of him by anybody. Since Apoecides went along with Epidicus when the money for the *fidicina* was carried to the *leno* (291 f., 295, 303-305, 374, 410-421), an important part of the slave's plan must have consisted in convincing Apoecides that the money (which was really handed over to Stratippocles) had been paid to the *leno*, but we are not told how the deception of Apoecides was accomplished. The *senex* was certainly hoodwinked in some way about the money, but the only part of the transaction that he reports concerns the hiring or, as he thinks, the purchase of the *fidicina*.

¹ Langrehr first noted this and explained it as one of the results of *contaminatio* (op. cit., pp. 11, 16). See p. 249 below.

² This is R. Mueller's interpretation (De Plauti Epidico, 1865), and it seems to be the essential meaning of line 365, whether we retain the manuscript reading *si quod ad eum adveniam* (with Leo) or adopt Camerarius's *Siqui ad eum adveniant* (with Goetz-Schoell), for in either case the *leno* is to say (dicat) that he has received money, etc. The sums do not agree since the price of Acropolistis was thirty *minae* according to the best authority (703).

³ Ladewig first noted this, op. cit., col. 1087.

⁴ Langrehr, *Miscell. Philol.*, pp. 13-14.

(410-421). This difficulty naturally suggests those which concern the girl herself.

The fidicina is alluded to or actually appears (in vv. 287-305, 313-318, 364-376, 411-420, 495-516). Epidicus's plan is clear enough. The old men have heard that Stratippocles is in love with a fidicina (191), and Epidicus plans to hire a fidicina whom he will instruct beforehand how to deceive the old men by pretending that she has been bought (312-318, 371-376). The account of Apoecides (411-420) is in harmony with this, i. e. if the fidicina has been coached beforehand by Epidicus, the old man's words merely indicate that she plays her part so well that he believes her a dupe of Epidicus. But the girl's own actions and words, when she appears (495 ff.), contradict the plan: she believes herself hired to play at a sacrifice¹ for an old man (500 f.), she has not even heard the name of Apoecides (496), and she does not know that she is talking with the very Periphanes about whose son she has heard gossip (508). Far from playing the conspirator, as the plan demanded, she acts as though she herself were a dupe.² There is therefore either a change of plan, i. e. Epidicus had not coached but had deceived her, or else she suddenly decides to tell the truth when the words of the soldier show (475 ff.) that the jig is up.³ In neither case is there any hint of the change.

¹Did Periphanes contemplate any sacrifice at all? At v. 314 Epid., debating what fidicina to show to Apoecides, apparently refers to a sacrifice for which Periphanes had ordered him to hire a fidicina and he determines to palm this girl off on Apoecides as the supposed *amica* of Stratippocles. If a real sacrifice was being arranged, then the girl was actually hired, as she says (500), and Apoecides was witnessing a *bona fide* transaction (411 ff.), although he believed the girl a dupe. But at v. 416 both old men seem to take Epidicus's statement to the girl (that she was being hired) as a clever lie, and Epid. certainly gave a wrong reason for a sacrifice (for the son's safe return), since early in the day, cf. *mane* (314), the old men did not know that Stratippocles would return that day. Or do they regard only this *reason* as a lie? Langrehr meets the difficulty by regarding '*mane . . . sibi*' (314-316) as a quotation, i. e. Epid. quotes what he will say to Apoecides. This would eliminate the sacrifice entirely. Dziatzko's view is preferable, see p. 249.

²Langrehr noted most of the difficulties, op. cit., pp. 11 ff. Cf. also Scaliger, note 5 below.

³So Langen, who admits however that she ought to say something to indicate her change of heart just as Acropolitis makes a clean breast

The discrepancies connected with the rôle of the soldier were the chief cause of Ladewig's theory of *contaminatio*:¹ in v. 153 he is Euboicus miles, in v. 300 he is Rhodius. And there are other difficulties involving both the soldier and Acropolitis. How can Epidicus plan (153-155) that Stratippocles shall sell Acropolitis to a soldier when she is at the time regarded by Periphanes as his daughter² and had certainly been manumitted?³ How does the soldier know⁴ that she is in the house of Periphanes (438, 457), and if she had been his amica (457), why did Stratippocles (153 ff.) know nothing about him? The soldier disappears absolutely from the play without obtaining any satisfaction (492) and the only allusion to the fate of Acropolitis is the hint that Stratippocles may return to her (653). It has also been objected that Periphanes, for one who has just recovered a long lost daughter, pays Acropolitis scant attention.⁵

The foregoing outline shows that the Epidicus contains many serious difficulties, and there has been a general disposition to regard it as obscure and too brief for so complicated a plot and so many characters. Necessary parts of the preliminary history are omitted or referred to very late in the play, trickery is planned, at times obscurely, and then changed without warning or dropped entirely, plans for coming action are

of her guile (591 ff.) in a similar situation. He assumes a lacuna after v. 495 in which there was an aside by the girl: *actum est, etc.*

¹ Op. cit., col. 1089.

² Goetz (1878), pp. xxi-xxii, cites from a copy of Camerarius's Basel ed. of 1558 a note by Scaliger on v. 417, 'At quomodo potuit eam emere Apoecides?' and on the lower margin, *Pessima olkoroula*. Nam aut virgo est aut fidicina conductitia quam adducit Apoecides. Si virgo est, ut verisimile est, non emetur. Quomodo domo auferatur ut conductitia illi supponatur? Nam Epidicus abest. Si autem conductitia, quomodo emi potuit, cum ipsamet neget se eo die emi potuisse et quinquennio ante manumissam? O. Crusius discovered in a Paris manuscript another note on vv. 151 ff. in which Scaliger remarked the difficulty of getting rid of Acropolitis when Periphanes was treating her as his daughter, cf. Goetz, ibid. liv.

³ The only direct statement that she had been manumitted is gossip (507 f.), but since Periph. believed her to be his daughter, he must have manumitted her, cf. Scaliger, preceding note.

⁴ Langrehr, op. cit., p. 15.

⁵ Langrehr, Plautina, 1886, p. 17. But cf. Rud. 1204 f.

not carried out, and the close of the play fails to satisfy the demands of the situation which has been created.

The mass of contradictions, inconsistencies, and improbabilities in the plays of Plautus may be attributed to several general causes: the methods of Plautus himself, who was in many matters very careless; the phenomena of *retractatio*, which is a convenient term for all the changes made by those who produced the plays, and especially by those who revived them in later generations;¹ the interpolations which crept into the text after the plays ceased to be acted, i. e. chiefly during the period of the empire;² and the accidents which befell the text in the process of its transmission. One who studies the difficulties must bear in mind all these possible causes with their variations, and it will simplify our examination of the Epidicus if we can exclude any of them. It may be said at once that interpolation in the sense referred to has had no appreciable effect upon the

¹ It is probable that every play underwent changes even at its first presentation, after it had left the hands of Plautus, and the changes during the poet's lifetime may have been considerable, although the great revival seems to have occurred about a generation after his death, cf. Cas. prolog. Since it is usually impossible to fix the date of alterations due to *retractatio*, it is better to include under the term all phenomena which can be assigned to revisers of the plays while they were living dramas, in distinction from those which are attributable to Plautus's original version or to the scholarly activity of later ages.

² In this general classification I am assuming that the Greek originals were as free from serious defects in art as one can reasonably expect of comedy. Professor Prescott has recently questioned the correctness of this assumption (Cl. Philol. XI, 1916, 125 ff.), reminding us—quite properly—that it is dangerous to assume that all the writers of the *μέτα* were as careful as Menander. But in his tendency to attribute clumsy composition, etc., to the Greek poets, Professor Prescott seems to me to go to the other extreme and assume a degree of deficiency on their part which is just as unlikely as the assumption which he combats. There can be no doubt, it seems to me, that Philemon, Diphilus, and the rest resembled Menander and Terence much more closely than they resembled Plautus. I am speaking of course in very general terms; the resemblance would be closer, for example, in plays in which stories of a serious type were presented (the originals of the Rudens or the Epid.), far less close in those of a farcical character (original of the Most.). But the question is too large for discussion here, especially since Professor Prescott has promised additional evidence in support of his view. The present article was complete in its main outlines before Professor Prescott's views appeared.

plot of the Epidicus. Of the methods of Plautus himself one which has been a fruitful cause of difficulties is *contaminatio*, the dovetailing of parts taken from two or more originals into one play. The defects of the Epidicus have been attributed, in part at least, to *contaminatio* by several scholars, but the play lacks two of the most striking features of a contaminated play—excessive length and traces of two plots. The Epidicus has 733 verses; no certainly contaminated play has much less than a thousand lines, e. g. the Andria and Adelphoe have 981 and 997 lines respectively, and each of the plays which best illustrate the process in Plautus, the Miles and the Poenulus, is nearly twice as long as the Epidicus. This point is of course not conclusive in itself, but when we add the fact that there are not clear evidences of two plots imperfectly joined in the Epidicus, the process of *contaminatio* becomes a very unlikely explanation of the difficulties of this play. As Langen¹ has pointed out, the two plots which the upholders of *contaminatio* find in this play are so well combined that it is impossible to separate them. In other words *contaminatio* must be demonstrated in Plautus by means of imperfect sutures in the plays themselves, since there is no Donatus, as in the case of Terence, to give us information which we could not reasonably infer from the text alone.

The defects of the Epidicus, therefore, if attributable to Plautus himself, must be due to some process different from *contaminatio*. But *contaminatio* is only one of the many methods employed by Plautus in dealing with his Greek originals, and in the Epidicus certain difficulties can be traced, thanks to the results of a brilliant article by Karl Dziatzko,² to the freedom with which Plautus treated the Greek original of the play.

Dziatzko, approaching the Epidicus from the point of view of one who was seeking analogies for an outline of Menander's Georgos, argued convincingly that Plautus has based his play

¹ Plaut. Stud., pp. 146-147. Langen remarks that in both the Miles and Poen. the two lines of trickery are directed towards the same object; in the Epid. towards different objects, and the first deception is already completed when the play opens.

² Der Inhalt des Georgos von Menander, Rhein. Mus. LIV (1899), 497 ff., ibid. LV (1900), 104 ff.

on a Greek model in which the complications ended in the marriage of a brother to his half-sister (*δμοταρία*).¹ Such marriages although not common were countenanced by Greek law, but were regarded by the Romans as incest. Therefore Plautus could not present such a plot to his Roman audience and was forced to alter it in such a way that all reference to this kind of marriage was removed.

Dziatzko has thus supplied us with a motive which explains many of the peculiarities of the Epidicus, and he himself pointed out that on this hypothesis we understand why the preparations for Stratippocles's marriage come to naught. At v. 190 Periphanes is planning to marry off the youth just as soon as he returns. In the original at this point probably the bride's name, i. e. the name of the *δμοταρία* occurred. The wedding is referred to at vv. 267, 283, 361—naturally in the Latin play without mentioning the bride's name. The proposed sacrifice of Periphanes (316, 415, 500) is probably a remnant of what was in the Greek one of the preparations for the wedding. Moreover Stratippocles is represented as very much in love with Telestis (54, 133, 148, 362 ff.)—a fact which would naturally precede a happy marriage—but Plautus breaks this off abruptly and lamely (652). If Periphanes had some other girl in mind for his son, the plan ought to be carried out, since the affair with Acropolitis was displeasing to him.

¹ For the Greek attitude towards such marriages, Dziatzko referred to H. Blümner, Gr. Privatalt., 1882, pp. 260 ff., and Schoemann-Lipsius, Gr. Alt. I (1897), 375. Kretschmar (De Menandri reliquiis nuper repertis, 1906, pp. 16 f.) supplies a number of actual cases: Nepos, Cimon, I, 1-2, Habebat autem in matrimonio sororem germanam suam, nomine Elpinicen, non magis amore quam more ductus: namque Atheniensibus licet eodem patre natas uxores ducere.

Plutarch, Themistocles, 32, Θυγατέρας δὲ πλεον ἔσχεν, ὃν Μηνσιππολέμαν μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐπιγαμθεῖσης γενομένην Ἀρχέππολις δὲ ἀδελφὸς οὐκ ὃν δμοτήτριος θύημεν.

Minucius Felix, Oct. 31, 3, ius est apud Persas misceri cum matribus, Aegyptiis et Atheniensibus cum sororibus legitima conubia. (This is not accurate. Minucius is attacking pagan customs.) Add Seneca, Apocol. 8, Athenis dimidium licet, Alexandriae totum. (Seneca is speaking of the supposed relations of Silanus with his sister.) Probably the sister marriage's of the Ptolemies were an outgrowth in part of this custom, cf. e. g. Theoc. XVII, 130.

For the Roman attitude, cf. Marquardt, Privatleben, I, pp. 30 ff.

This hypothesis accounts also for the difficulties connected with the soldier and Acropolitis. In the Latin play there is a reference to the sale of Acropolitis to the soldier (153 ff., cf. 300 ff., where Periphanes is willing to sell his son's amica, although he does not yet know that he has already bought her, and 437 ff., where he tries to sell her to the soldier). If we assume that in the Greek play she was actually sold or, if manumitted, turned over to the soldier, we can understand the facts as given in the Epidicus, i. e. Plautus having dispensed with the marriage of Stratippocles to his half-sister wished to make some provision, however lame, for the youth and so reserved Acropolitis for him (653). This would explain the contradictions noted above between the plans concerning Acropolitis and the failure to carry them out. It would explain also, although this is not in itself a serious difficulty, why the soldier is left without satisfaction.

The missing details of the preliminary history were presented according to Dziatzko, in a monologue of the Greek play spoken by Periphanes just before v. 166. Plautus omitted this monologue because it was concerned chiefly with the proposed marriage of Stratippocles.

The Greek original was not, on Dziatzko's hypothesis, a mere comedy of intrigue; characterization was prominent, and Periphanes was the chief figure, cf. the traces left at 166 ff., 382 ff., 526 ff. He atoned for his former sins by marrying Philippa and by the marriage between his children. Plautus has diverted attention from the obscurities and inconsistencies resulting from his treatment of this original by inserting into the midst of the action the figure of Epidicus, through whose wit a solution of the conflicting interests is effected, cf. 732,

hic is homost qui libertatem malitia invenit sua—

a line which in the best manuscript is assigned to the poet. Remarking that the Epidicus is an excellent illustration of the independence which Plautus might exercise, if he chose, in the treatment of a Greek original Dziatzko suggests that the poet's liking for the play (Bacch. 214 f.) may have been due to his consciousness of this independence.

Dziatzko's theory is thus a thoroughgoing effort to attribute the difficulties of the play—apart from some minor accidents

to the text—to Plautus himself.¹ He has certainly given the right answer to some of the most important questions, but his sweeping assignment of all the difficulties to one general cause is not adequately supported and can be disproved, I believe, in important particulars. He has in fact confused two questions: (1) How far does the Epidicus represent its Greek original? and (2) Is the Epidicus in its present form Plautine? He has answered the first question in the main correctly, but in attempting to include in it an answer to the second he has not only gone too far but has failed to supply the sort of evidence that we need. Before we can say with any degree of confidence that the Epidicus in its present form is essentially Plautine we must determine the method of Plautus in dealing with motives and situations of the same type as those which appear in this play. But first let us indicate the points which Dziatzko's theory does not explain, criticizing at the same time some details of his work.

The lack of necessary information concerning the early life of Periphanes which seems such a serious defect in the exposition is due, according to Dziatzko, to the excision by Plautus of a monologue of the Greek play which was so full of references to the proposed marriage between Stratippocles and the δημοσαρπία that the Roman poet could not use it. But why could he not make use of those facts which we need to know—the visit of Periphanes to Epidaurus, the birth of Telestis in Thebes, etc.—without at the same time using the marriage motif? He has in fact given this information late in the play (540 ff., 554, 635 ff.) and we must conclude that he could have given it in the exposition,² the place where we expect to find it whether it is repeated late in the play or not.³

¹ Dziatzko rejects *contaminatio*, *retractatio*, and the theory, urged chiefly by Leo, that the Epid. once had a prologue.

² If vv. 87 ff. represent a corresponding passage at approximately the same point in the Greek play, Dziatzko's assumption that the requisite Vorgeschichte occurred in a monologue of Periphanes just before vv. 166 ff. is untenable, for vv. 87 ff. imply that at least part of the information (the story of Telestis's birth) has preceded. This part therefore could not have been *first* presented in a monologue which *followed* vv. 87 ff., see also pp. 256 ff.

³ I assume for the moment that Graeco-Roman technique required that such information should be given in the *expositio*, cf. Leo, Plaut.

Moreover Dzitzko's theory, although it accounts for the dropping of the plans for Stratippocles's marriage (including perhaps the lame conclusion of his fate)¹ and for the difficulties connected with the soldier and Acropolitis, does not account for the failure of Periphanes to marry Philippa and especially for the very obscure and inconsistent trickery of the play. These difficulties still remain unless we assume that Plautus wrote more briefly, more carelessly, more obscurely in this play than in any other. The question is not whether the play is sufficiently intelligible to satisfy the requirements of an audience seeking mere amusement, for the play could be acted and probably was once acted in essentially its present form, but whether its difficulties are such as Plautus himself would have permitted in one of his compositions. The standard to be applied is not that of the *réa* nor, except indirectly, that of an audience or reader—even a Roman audience or reader—but the standard of Plautus himself. He learned his literary art chiefly from the *réa* and he had to please a certain rude type of audience, but we must determine what his actual methods were from a study of all his own plays. If the Epidicus were unique in its content and motives, it would be difficult to apply this standard, but it is not unique. It has a number of typical features: the familiar love affair between a wild young man and a slave girl (here two girls), the father who has sinned in his youth and has an illegitimate daughter, the slave who cheats his old master out of money in order to aid the love of his young master, a leno, a soldier, and finally the familiar *ávayvóποις* (here appearing in a double form).

For light upon the defects of the exposition one turns naturally to other plays which develop to an *ávayvóποις*: *Captivi*,

Forsch.², 199 (on the Epid.), and in general Chapp. III-IV; Legrand, Daos, 490 ff. For the detailed support of this point so far as Plautus is concerned see pp. 254 ff.

¹ The futures of young men are summarily disposed of without marriage in the *Most.* (1164), *Adel.* 997, cf. *Phorm.* 1036-1046, but we expect some authoritative person and not a slave to say the final words. Similarly we should not find difficulty in the practical neglect of Acropolitis if she were not so intimately connected with Periphanes. *Philematium* in the *Most.* is absolutely dropped and *Anterastylis* in the *Poen.*, though recognized as freeborn, is left without a husband or a lover. But neither of these ladies plays quite the same rôle as Acropolitis and we miss at least some final words from Periphanes about her.

Casina, Cistellaria, Curculio, Menaechmi, Poenulus, Rudens, and Vidularia. Two of these, Cistellaria and Vidularia, on account of their fragmentary condition are of little service,¹ but an examination of the rest yields important results.

Leo has emphasized the fact that with two exceptions all these plays are provided with an expository prologue spoken by somebody not connected with the action, i. e. since there is always a previous history, Plautus and probably his originals think it necessary to place the situation clearly before the audience. Thus in six cases out of eight the chief means employed by Plautus is the expository prologue. Leo indeed pushes this point to its extreme logical conclusion and infers that the Curculio and the Epidicus, the two exceptions, once had prologues.² He admits that Terence uses no expository prologue for plays of this type and that the Curculio needs none, and he states the possibility that in these two plays Plautus may have wished the *āvayrōpōs* to come as a surprise. He prefers to assume the loss of prologues because of two important facts: the serious obscurities of the Epidicus in its present form, and the failure, in the Curculio, to mention Epidaurus as the scene of the play until v. 341.

Leo's theory must be admitted to be possible, but it is far from probable even in the case of the Curculio and still less probable for the Epidicus. The Curculio may be considered, as Leo saw, an anticipation of the Terentian method;³ the addition of a prologue would simply make clearer a play that is already clear. But no prologue can easily be conceived which would remove all the obscurities of the Epidicus. I shall return to the Curculio below. Meanwhile if we compare the exposition of the Epidicus with the expository portions, both prologue and early scenes, of the other plays of this group,

¹ It should be noted, however, that both these plays have prologues, and that the prologue of the Cist. (120-148, 149-202) provides a thorough exposition, although we cannot follow the development within the play. Selenium, the heroine, is much like Telestis: she is *pudica* (100), as all heroines of this type must be except so far as the lover is concerned, cf. Poen., Rud., Aul., Andr.; she is 'recognized', but not by a brother.

² So Legrand, Daos, 490 ff., 504.

³ The play would be an exception, on this hypothesis, to Leo's rule that when the scene is not Athens, the fact must be mentioned in a prologue, Plaut. Forsch.², 199 f.

the Epidicus proves to be obscure and therefore abnormal. A few words will suffice to show how Plautus usually deals with the kind of information which is lacking in the exposition of the Epidicus—the early history of heroines like Telestis.

In the Cistellaria the story of Selenium's birth, the same story as that of the birth of Telestis, is told in the *leno's speech* (123-148) and in that of Auxilium (156-196).¹ The same is true of Casina, the heroine of the Casina, cf. prolog. 39-46, 79-81. The *ἀναγνώρισις* of this play has been reduced to the lowest terms (1013-1014),² but the omission of details causes no obscurities. In the Poenulus the whole story of Anterastylis and Adelphasium, the two girls who are about to become meretrices, is told in the prologue vv. 59-122; cf. Rudens, prolog. 35 ff., for the early history of Palaestra.

Among the plays containing recognition scenes, therefore, the Curculio affords the best opportunity for comparison with the Epidicus, since both plays lack prologues. There is in the Curculio no preparation for the *ἀναγνώρισις*, although the exposition is clear in all other respects. If then we were to assume, against Leo, that this play never had a prologue, we should have, in the failure to prepare for the *ἀναγνώρισις*, the best analogy to the Epidicus. Nevertheless I cannot believe that the analogy would be cogent. The early history of Planesium is not an essential feature of the first 532 lines of the play, in which her soldier brother does not appear. In this part of the play the interest centers in Curculio and his wiles, and Curculio knows nothing about the secret of Planesium's birth. In the Epidicus on the other hand the trickster Epidicus is not only the one person who knows all those who take part in the *ἀναγνώρισις*, but he has made use of his knowledge to deceive his old master into the purchase of a girl whom he believes, because of this knowledge, to be his daughter (87 ff., 598 ff.). The trickster and his tricks, therefore, are in this play inextricably connected with the story of those who take part in the

¹ If vv. 125, 130-132 were added by *retractatores* in order that Auxilium's speech might be omitted (Leo, Lindsay), the resultant shortening would illustrate the process which may have caused many of the obscurities in the Epidicus—a willingness to dispense with all but the bare essentials.

² Cf. Leo, Plaut. Forsch.², 207 f., Röm. Litt., 127 f., Cantica, 104-106.

ἀναγνώρισις. Moreover Periphanes in the early part of the play knows where Philippa is and is planning to marry her (166 ff.), so that the possibility of an intention on the part of Plautus to present a surprise *ἀναγνώρισις*, like that in the *Curculio*, is precluded. Among the plays having *ἀναγνώρισις* the *Epidicus* is unique in this employment of the trickster's knowledge of the heroine's story as a basis for deception. The closest resemblance to this peculiarity occurs in the *Poenulus* (787 ff.), where Syncerastus, the slave of the *leno*, informs Milphio, the trickster, that the two supposed meretrices are in reality free-born girls (894 ff.) and suggests that Agorastocles, the lover, can make use of this knowledge to ruin the *leno*. Milphio accepts the suggestion and plans that Hanno shall personate the father of the girls, but it is unnecessary to complete the trick since Hanno proves in fact to be their father—unnecessary in any event since the *leno* is already in the power of Agorastocles.¹ Moreover the *Poenulus* has a prologue.

But although the *Epidicus* is unique in its inextricable combination of trickery with the preliminary history when that history concerns the heroine's birth, there are several plays in which the preliminary history, of a different type indeed, involves trickery. These plays resemble the *Epidicus* only in the point that deception of some kind has been accomplished before the play opens. It is possible therefore to determine Plautus's treatment of this element.

At the opening of the *Amphitruo* Jupiter and Mercury have assumed respectively the likenesses of Amphitruo and Sosia. Minute information on this point is given in the prologue, vv. 115-147, even to distinctive ornaments which shall be visible to the spectators only (142-145), so that they may not confuse the gods with the mortals! The lengthening of the night and the stealing of King Pterela's bowl, both of which are promi-

¹ Milphio differs from *Epidicus* in that he avails himself of information given by somebody else, but it is the same kind of information. The *Truculentus* also resembles the *Epid.* in one important point: the assumption until very late in the play (825) of a fact usually given in a prologue—that Diniarchus has wronged the daughter of Calicles. This omission produces obscurity at v. 771, etc. But the resemblance is due to accident for it is practically certain that the needed information has fallen out of the prologue, cf. the lacuna after v. 17. See Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*², p. 206.

nent features of the deception, are also carefully made known to the audience (prolog. 113 f., 138 f.). Moreover there are many resumptive references to all these features within the body of the play in order that the audience may by no possibility become confused, cf. 265-269 (Mercury has assumed the likeness of Sosia), 470 (Mercury will continue his deception), 497 (Mercury announces the entrance of the spurious Amphitruo in a scene which is in fact a sort of second prologue), 277-290 (the night is longer than usual), etc.

Similarly in the *Captivi*, *Miles*, *Rudens*, and *Menaechmi* parts of the deception have been accomplished or bases for deception exist before the play opens, and in every case the situation is carefully explained both in the prologue and within the body of the play.¹ The evidence is, therefore, that when a deception has been carried out before the play opens, Plautus avails himself of a prologue and even repeats essential points within the play proper. The *Epidicus* is in fact the only play of Plautus (lacking a prologue) in which such a deception is mentioned without elucidation.² Thus everything that we know about the manner of Plautus precludes the view that the meager reference at v. 87 f. to a trick already accomplished can be taken as an anticipation of the Terentian technique. If Plautus had wished for once to abandon his usual practice and dispense with a prologue, he would not have been satisfied with so brief a reference as that in the *Epidicus*. The conclusion is inevitable that Plautus himself included in the play an adequate exposition of this trick and that vv. 87-88 are a resumptive reference³ to that exposition, i. e. that the real

¹Cf. *Capt.*, prolog. 35 ff. (man and master have exchanged clothes and names), cf. 223 ff., etc. *Miles*, prolog. 138 ff. (the secret passage has been constructed), cf. 181 f., 187 f., etc. At 145 ff. the fooling of Sceledrus is announced *before* any reason for it has arisen! *Rud.*, prolog. 43 ff. (the leno has tried to give Plesidippus the slip). *Menaech.*, prolog. 17 ff. (the resemblance of the twins which is the basis of the complications). *Cas.*, prolog. 50 ff. (plans of the opposing forces for winning Casina). The Casina is the play concerning whose revival the best evidence exists. If the revivalists altered the play, they have certainly avoided obscurities.

²In the *Phormio* of Terence the trick by which the marriage of Antipho is effected has been accomplished before the play opens, but Terence, as is well known, relies on his *expositio* to present all parts of the situation, cf. for this case vv. 124-136.

³Cf. the references n. 1 (above). The *Miles* offers the best analogy. Everything necessary to understand the secret passageway and its use

exposition once preceded the remnant now existing. Analogy indicates that this exposition was contained in a prologue and this inference is supported by the fact that there is no suitable place for it within the first scene unless we assume that it was originally included in the monologue of Epidicus (81 ff.) and that vv. 87-88 are a later substitution or a 'cut' by *retractatores*, and so the only remnant of the Plautine version.

But if Dziatzko's hypothesis and the loss of a prologue or some other expository passage account for a number of the difficulties, several still remain to be explained, see p. 251 f. The first of these is the failure to state that Periphanes carried out his intention of marrying Philippa. This omission causes no obscurity, and when a plot has developed in such a way as to make a certain result a foregone conclusion, the result itself is often stated in summary fashion.¹ The development of the Epidicus brings both Philippa and her daughter into the house of Periphanes (601, 657), and we know the old man's intention (168-172). A few words would have sufficed to state the result, and it is not in accordance with ancient technique to omit these few words. It is impossible to say definitely whether Plautus himself neglected to add such a passage or whether it has been omitted by those who cut the play in later times, but the second hypothesis is much more probable since there is no analogy for such an omission in the case of a major character.²

The obscurities connected with the trickery constitute one of the most serious difficulties of the play. Excluding the first trick, which has already been discussed, the object and methods of the deception within the play are quite normal and it is possible to compare the Epidicus in these respects with several other plays. The trickster plans and carries out a scheme by which he secures money from his old master to aid his young

is carefully made known (prolog. vv. 136-153), so that later brief references are enough, e. g. *res palamst* (173), the gestures used with *hicine* (181), *transire huc* (182), cf. 187 f., 195, 199, 227, etc. The situations in the Amph. and the Capt. are so confusing and pervade the action so thoroughly that the resumptive references are more complete than *Epid.* 87 f.

¹Cf. *Aul.* 793, *Cas.* 1012-1014, *Circ.* 728, *Poen.* 1278, etc.

²There is no case quite like that of Periphanes—a senex contemplating marriage with a woman whom he has wronged years before although such a marriage is presupposed in the *Cist.* (prolog. 177 ff.).

master's love affair. This type of deception is common enough, cf. *Bacchides*, *Persa*, *Pseudolus*, *Phormio*, etc. The methods also are common enough: lying and thieving—these go without saying—but especially the use of one person to represent another, the method of masquerading or personation. By lying *Epidicus* secures the money for the purchase, as *Periphanes* thinks, of the son's *amica* whom the old man intends to sell out of the son's reach. The slave must of course produce a girl to personate this supposed *amica*. For this purpose he secures the hired *fidicina*. In all this we do not demand that the object shall be a permanent or a worthy one nor even that the methods shall be very plausible. We are dealing with comedy, and we must not apply a high standard of probability to a form of art whose primary object was after all to raise a laugh. As a matter of fact the object of the deception in the *Epidicus* is wholly ephemeral, as is usual, and the old men are gullible enough. But we have a right to demand that the trick as a trick should be planned and executed clearly, else it fails in large measure to attain its humble object. If an audience does not fully understand a trick, the resultant laughter is not unmixed with bewilderment. Perspicuity, not probability, is the criterion. Did *Plautus* understand this? The only way to ascertain his convictions, as I have urged before, is to examine the plays.¹

The situation in the *Bacchides* closely resembles that in the *Epidicus*. *Mnesilochus*, like *Stratiippocles*, returns from abroad during the course of the play and is assisted by his slave *Chrysalus* to secure money for the purchase of his *amica*, *Bacchis*. Moreover the money is secured from the young man's father by lying and by convincing him that the girl is the wife of a soldier, i. e. that she is what she is not, cf. the *fidicina* in the *Epidicus*. In fact the *senex* is fooled twice, for the son through mistaken jealousy of his friend *Pistoclerus* returns to his father the money which *Chrysalus*'s first effort, mere lying, has placed at his disposal. The second trick is then planned and carried out before the eyes of the audience, aided of course by the opportune arrival of the soldier (842). The gullible

¹ All the trickery in *Plautus* has a bearing of course, but an examination of the most closely analogous plays will suffice for my present purpose.

old man gives up 200 Philips to buy off the soldier (903) and another 200 which he is led to believe that his son has promised Bacchis (1059 ff.) before she leaves him. Thus there is a large amount of deception in the Bacchides but there is not one serious obscurity.¹

In the Persa the money with which Toxilus buys the freedom of his mistress from Dordalus, the leno, is obtained by simple theft. But the stolen money must be restored (324-327), and so Toxilus tells Dordalus that his master has just sent home a beautiful Persian captive and that she is for sale. Lucris, the daughter of Saturio, a parasite, is induced to play the rôle of the captive while Sagaristio, a friend of Toxilus, acts that of an attendant Persian selling agent. Dordalus falls into the trap and after he has paid over the purchase money, Saturio appears and hales him into court where of course the sale of a free girl is declared null and void. But since Dordalus has made the purchase *suo periclo* (524, 715), and since the Persian agent has departed to his ship (709 f.), he makes no attempt to recover his money.

The chief method of deception is here the same as in the Epidicus—personation; but it is planned and carried out with perfect clearness.² The audience is even told just how Sagar-

¹ I cannot agree with Leo (Röm. Litt., 119 f.) that the Bacch. is a contaminated play. There are really only two deceptions: (1) the lie about the pirate ship, and (2) the deception by which Nicobulus is convinced that Bacchis is the soldier's wife. The second deception is used *twice*, but the deception itself is one and indivisible. The only difficulty that affects the trickery in the slightest degree is the one noted by Langen at v. 347: that Chrysalus informs Nicobulus where Mnesilochus is, although the success of the first trick depends upon keeping father and son apart until Chrysalus can forewarn the son (366 f.). But, omitting possible explanations, the difficulty is not serious, for the audience learns almost immediately (390 ff.) that Chrysalus has met the youth and put him on his guard.

² Some scholars have made a difficulty of the fact that Sagaristio attends the final banquet instead of going to Eretria (259). But he did not have to be in Eretria at once (cf. 260 *die septumei*), even if vv. 262 ff. do not explicitly state that he will not go at all.

The absence of Saturio and Lucris from the banquet has been attributed by Professor Prescott, with great probability, to the fact that being freeborn they cannot take part in such a slave celebration (Cl. Phil. XI, 128 f.). Besides they were forced into the trick by the power which Toxilus possessed over Saturio (140 ff.) and they require

ristio, the pseudo-Persian, instead of going to his ship, is to sneak per angiportum... per hortum (678 f.) into the house of Toxilus's master, and the girl is coached upon the stage, first in a scene which is practically a rehearsal (III, 1) and then at the crucial moment by asides from Toxilus and Sagaristio (IV, 4). There is a wealth of hints to the audience.

In the *Pseudolus* also the wiles of a slave provide the chief interest and the object is the same as in the *Epidicus*: to obtain money for the young master's love affair. *Pseudolus* guarantees to trick Ballio, the *leno*, out of the girl. As in the *Epidicus* a soldier is anxious to secure the same girl, and there is a second *senex* and a second *adulescens*. The first part of the play contains an immense amount of bragging threats and aimless assertion of resourcefulness on the part of the slave (120 ff., 232 ff., 382 ff.), but he himself characterizes them at their true value (394 ff.) and admits that he has not *gutta certi consili*. His dilemma is in fact worse than that of *Epidicus*, for his old master Simo has an inkling of the situation (408) and soon becomes fully enlightened (481 ff.). It is not until the entrance of Harpax, the soldier's messenger, at v. 595, that *Pseudolus* has any real basis for his wiles, and at once there is a clear statement that new plans are necessary and all previous ones abandoned (601-603).

The only important feature of the first 594 lines, so far as the real trickery is concerned, is the assurance given by *Pseudolus* to Simo that he will get the necessary money from Simo himself (507-518) and will cheat Ballio out of the girl (524-530), and the promise of Simo to supply the money if *Pseudolus* accomplishes both feats, i. e. the *senex* practically bets the slave that he cannot get the money from him or cheat the *leno*. The turn given to *Pseudolus*'s plans (if he had any!) by the arrival of Harpax renders it unnecessary to carry out his intention of securing the money from Simo, and in the end Simo pays his bet because the other part of *Pseudolus*'s task—the cheating of Ballio—has been so well done (1213, 1238, 1307 f.).¹ The

no reward other than the continuance of his favor. Like many other instruments of trickery in Plautus they disappear when their rôles are played, cf. *Simia* (*Pseud.*), the *sycophanta* (*Tri.*), etc., cf. *Prescott*, *ibid.*

¹ Leo finds a contradiction between *Pseudolus*'s promise (1) to get the money from Simo and to outwit the *leno*, and (2) Simo's offer of the

real plan required only five minae, the amount brought by Harpax to complete the payment for the soldier, and this sum is furnished by Charinus (734) with the assurance from Pseudolus that when Simo pays his bet, Pseudolus will pay back the loan. So when Pseudolus receives the 20 minae which he has won (1241), he has more than he needs to repay Charinus and is able to promise the return of dimidium aut plus to Simo (1328).

The real trickery therefore begins with the arrival of Harpax (595) and the first step is taken when Pseudolus, by claiming to be Ballio's servant, secures from Harpax the soldier's letter to Ballio. The method by which Ballio is outwitted is again, as in the *Persa* and the *Epidicus*, personation. A pseudo-Harpax is dressed up and sent to Ballio with the letter and five minae, and to him Ballio surrenders the girl. The entire transaction is clearly planned even to the dress which the false messenger is to wear (725-755), and as clearly executed (956-1051). The long scene between Ballio, Simo, and the real Harpax (1103-1237) merely clinches the result. We may remark in passing that although the soldier recovers his money (1230) he loses the girl, which is the same fate that the military gentlemen suffer in the *Epidicus*, *Bacchides*, and *Curculio*.

The illustrations given indicate how clearly Plautus presents many of the same types of deception which occur in the *Epidicus*. There is however one important feature which cannot be paralleled in the three plays just considered. It has been noted (pp. 244 ff.) that in accordance with the plans of Epidicus the hoodwinking of the *leno* (364-370) and of Apoecides—so far as the false purchase of the *fidicina* is concerned—take place off the stage, and we have seen that the references to the actions do not agree with the plans. How does Plautus deal with this type of situation elsewhere? Light is thrown on this question by the *Asinaria* and the *Captivi*.

money if Pseudolus accomplishes *both* tasks by evening (Gött. gelehrt. Nachr., 1903, 250). But surely, since Pseudolus knows that money will be necessary in order to fool the *leno*, vv. 535-537 mean, 'Will you give me of your own free will' whatever money I may have to filch from you in order to cheat the *leno*? For the cheating of the *leno* is to *precede* (cf. 524). Pseudolus did not, of course, cheat Simo out of any money for the very good reason that the arrival of Harpax suggested an easier method.

In the *Asinaria* old Demaenetus is hand and glove with the two slaves, Libanus and Leonida, in cheating the Mercator out of the money necessary for young Argyrippus's love affair. The mercator is successfully convinced that the masquerading Leonida is the steward Saurea (II, 4), but he is so cautious that he refuses to pay over the money except in the presence of Demaenetus. Opportunely (!) Demaenetus is in the forum at the banker's (116, 126), and the final acts of the deception—the identification of Leonida as Saurea and the payment to him of the money—take place off the stage. These acts are clearly stated by Libanus (580-583) in perfect harmony with the other parts of the intrigue.

In the *Captivi*, Hegio is induced to believe that Philocrates is the slave Tyndarus, and he releases the pseudo-slave in the hope of recovering his own son. As in the *Asinaria*, the deception of the old man is presented on the stage, but the results—the release and sending away of Philocrates—occur off the stage and are clearly stated by Hegio (III, 2).¹

It is in fact the general practice of Plautus to be clear in his references to events that occur off the stage, cf. such narratives as Bromia's account of the birth of Hercules (*Amph.* V, 1), Curculio's tale of his deception of the soldier (*Curc.* 329-363), Strobilus's account of his theft of Euclio's money-pot (*Aul.* IV, 8), etc. Often indeed the poet goes so far as to present on the stage actions or parts of actions which have been announced to occur off the stage, e. g. *Mil.* 594 f., the senatus of the conspirators will take place intus, but (597 ff.) they come out and make their plan. Old Periplecomenus (*Mil.* 793 ff.) is to instruct the pseudo-wife and maid off the stage, but after he has brought them on, they are instructed all over again (874 ff.)! *Nequid peccetis paveo*, says Master Palaestrio, and this might be taken as the poet's motto in dealing with the spectators! Indeed the rights of the spectators in this matter are clearly recognized in the *Poenulus*. The *advocati* have been coached in their part off the stage and they are indignant that

¹ In the *Persa* the conviction of Dordalus is to occur off the stage before the praetor, cf. 741-752, and no statement is made later that it actually occurred. But the money (the essential thing) has already been secured and Dordalus, before his departure, laments its loss (742), so that his final conviction can safely be left to inference.

Agorastocles should wish them to rehearse,¹ but they recognize the rights of the spectators (550 ff.):

Omnia istaec scimus iam nos, si hi spectatores sciant.
Horunc hic nunc causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula:
Hos te satius est docere ut, quando agas, quid agas sciant.

The last line states very well the attitude of Plautus himself.²

It is necessary to add a few words concerning the contaminated plays, for it may be argued that if Plautus allowed such glaring inconsistencies as we have in the Miles and the Poenulus, we need not worry about the difficulties of the Epidicus. The answer to this objection is that although these plays contain striking inconsistencies, yet they are not, like the Epidicus, obscure. I must content myself with one or two illustrations.

In the Miles (596) the audience is led to expect a plan to be made on the stage. Such a plan is actually made (765 ff.) and is later carried out. At vv. 612-615 a plan is to be adopted inside the house, but no word of its nature is told, and after the long autobiography of Periplecomenus the real plan is developed. All this is clumsy, but not obscure. Similarly in the Epidicus, if the plan to deceive the leno were merely alluded to and if no attempt were made to state it, there would be no obscurity. If, to take another example, we were told that the plan concerning the fidicina had been abandoned or changed, as we are told in the Pseudolus in a similar situation (601 f.), there would be no obscurity. Again in the Poenulus the accomplishment of the first trick puts the leno absolutely in the power of Agorastocles, and yet another trick is begun against him! But there is no obscurity about either one, and the audience would certainly have been as glad to see a leno twice 'done' as a Bowery audience would be to see a double penalty for the villain.

This study is by no means complete, but enough has been said to indicate that the Epidicus is in several respects ab-

¹The rehearsal actually follows (III, 2) with all the conspirators present.

²The *retractatores* evidently cut all this unessential talk, cf. Leo, adnot. crit. on v. 503, who suggests that 543-546, 567-577 are a briefer version of the scene. This method of curtailing Plautine verbiage was probably applied to parts of the Epidicus, but the longer versions have not been preserved as in the Poen.

normal among the twenty plays; that a part of its peculiarities are probably due to the poet's treatment of an unusual Greek original, and others to the loss or intentional omission of a prologue or at least an expository passage early in the play, but that some difficulties, especially those connected with the trickery, should not be attributed to Plautus. These last difficulties were probably caused by those who cut the play during the period of its life upon the stage. In its present form the Epidicus is brief, complicated, and obscure, with an obvious tendency to present the bare essentials, particularly the comic parts, of the action. It is a sort of ancient 'movie' whose action touches only the high places, and this is a type of composition of which Plautus, with all his faults, is elsewhere not guilty.

ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

II.—APOPHONY AND RHYME WORDS IN VULGAR LATIN ONOMATOPOEIAS.

The vocabulary of language is extended mainly through combination of preexisting elements and through semantic change. This however should not induce us to underrate the importance of spontaneous creations at all periods of linguistic evolution. The relation between sound and meaning, as a rule, of course, is merely traditional and conventional. In a few cases however there is some connection between the sounds of a word and the ideas, feelings or sensations associated with it. The sound in that case is a natural symbol, though even there convention is far from being absent. Of that type, of course, are the onomatopoeias that are created from time to time, such as *chickadee*, *bobolink* and other imitative words adopted by the colonists in America. But the imitation is not always so complete. It may be more discrete. The harmony may exist between the movements, tensions, relaxations, etc. associated with ideas and those associated with the production of certain sounds, as e. g. relaxation and *fl* in Eng. *flabby*, Fr. *flasque*, Lat. *flaccus*, Du. *flauw*, etc. ; disgust and *-ouille* in Fr. *fripouille*, *bredouille*, *patouille*, etc. There are many other sounds which could as well evoke those sensations and often enough (as e. g. Fr. *-ouille* from *s-ouille*=Lat. *sucula*), the relation is a secondary one but still, in the minds of the people, the association exists and may prove capable of generating new words connected with similar sensations. In that way e. g. Eng. *smash*, *clash*, etc. seem to have been formed from *mash*, *thrash*, etc.

Another harmony exists between pitch and sound. Clear vowels associate better with high notes and dark sounds with low tone. Hence the vowel variation in onomatopoeias of motion as Eng. *chitchat*, *seesaw*, *tiptop*, *pingpong*, Fr. *zigzag*, *tictac*, Germ. *pifpaffpuff*, *bimbambum*, etc. that symbolize the rhythms of various movements. Hence the use of clear vowels for activity or intensity, proximity, smallness, while *o*, *u* are for passivity, gloom, remoteness, broadness, as in Batta

(Malayan) where "to creep" is *džarar* in general, *džirir* for small beings, *džurur* for big ones (cf. Gabelentz, *Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 222) or as in Woloff (Sudanese) in local suffixes: *baybe* "my here father", *bayba* "my there father", *baybu* "my yonder father". Wundt (*Sprache* I p. 3, 199) has collected many instances of that kind of phenomena. They play an important part in the grouping of words in our memory. In the same way as ideas are associated because they suggest similar images (metaphors), words can form series on account of a phonetic similitude.

Two types of series are most generally found. Either the same phonetic combination produces several words through variation of the accented vowel (Germ. *bammeln*, *bimmeln*, *bummeln*), or parts of a phonetic combination are transmitted to other words of kindred meaning (Eng. *flash*, *flare*, *flimmer*, or *mash*, *dash*, *clash*, etc.).

While both these types of formations have only been studied superficially in our modern languages, the material that Vulgar Latin can provide has remained practically neglected up to now, although it is especially abundant and presents a special interest for the history of many a Romance word.

I. ONOMATOPOEIC APOPHONY.

In the same way as we have imitative combinations as Eng. *pingpong*, *seesaw*, Fr. *zigzag*, Germ. *bimbambum*, etc. (cf. *supra*) we keep in our minds series like Germ. *knarren*, *knurren*, *knirren*; *flattern*, *flittern*; Fr. *claquer*, *cliquer*, etc.

Such series are due to variations in the impressions made on us by noises as well as to an unconscious rhythmical feeling in ourselves.

The vocalic scale, according to the general principles expounded above, corresponds roughly to changes in the quality of our sensations or affections. This correspondence, however, is often of a subtle character and often enough the vocalic change is influenced by the reminiscence of words, hovering in our memory. The latter phenomenon, known under the name of contamination, has been very active even in the traditional elements of language. Its action must have been much more decisive on those elements of speech that are directly under the influence of feeling and associations of feelings. Wundt

(Sp. p. 620) in the Germ. series *baumeln*, *bammeln*, *bimmeln*, *bummeln* thus explains *bammeln* as due to the influence of Germ. *Baum*. In *bummeln* on the other hand, I think, one would hardly deny the probability of a discrete influence of *dumm*, *stumm*, *stumpf*, *dumpf*, etc. referring to relaxation and nonsense. In the same way, besides *potta* "thick lip" and **patta* "thick foot", exists **pauta* (hence Eng. *paw*) apparently under the influence of *platta* "planis pedibus" which itself was a member in a secondary series *plotta* "flat fish" (Gr. $\tau\alpha\pi\lambda\omega\tau\delta$), *plattus-platta* "flat" (Gr. $\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\delta$), *plautus* "flat-footed", *plauta* "sole".

The series of *patta* and *platta* to which we are thus alluding here deserves to be the first to attract our attention on account of the various interesting phenomena which it illustrates:

1. **patta* and **pauta* are held to be of Teutonic origin. This, however, is not very likely. It is not common to find a genuine Germanic word with an initial *p*. Moreover the Teutonic representatives of it: Du. *poot*, Germ. *Pfote* are quite isolated in those languages and are almost as clearly derived from Latin as Eng. *paw* comes from O. Fr. *poue*. With Prov. *pauto*, all those words go back to Lat. **pauta*. *Patta*, on the contrary, survives not only in Fr. *patte* but also in Sp. *pata*, Port. *pata* "duck" and appears thus to be the earlier form. In all these languages **patta* and **pauta* are familiar and deprecative words for "foot". In the general derivatives, the word is used of "thick feet": *pataud* "dog with large paws", *patauger* "to dabble"; and of "clumsiness" in general: *patouiller* "to muddle" (deprecative suffix, *-ouiller*), *patois* "clumsy language", etc.

The semantic relation with *plautus*, *-a*, *-um*, "flat-footed" is thus more than sufficient to account for a contamination changing **patta* into **pauta*, as said above. The etymology of **patta* is unknown. The word is either a childlike corruption of *pedem* or a mere "Lallwort". The *tt* in **patta* while **pauta* has *t* is due to the tendency of Vulgar Latin to reduplicate consonants after single vowels while this never takes place after diphthongs. This reduplication is a well-known feature of popular Latin. It is found mostly in familiar words, such as abbreviated personal epithets: *vorri*, *varro*, *lippus*, etc. names of utensils: *cappa*, *baccus*, *cippus*, *brocca*, *stroppa*, etc. It is

peculiarly frequent in onomatopoeic words, probably on account of its intensive value.

Besides **patta* existed **potta* "thick lip". The affective shade being exactly the same, it is difficult to doubt that both words were associated in the people's minds. One word may have been formed from the other. They are both expressive of a thickness or a clumsiness of the lips. *potta* is likely to be the older word, though it is known only through Prov. *poto* "thick lip", Lorr. *pot* "lip", Swiss *pota* "grimace", Béarn. *putu* "kiss", It. *potta* "cunnus". The French expressions: *main potte* "thick hand", *jambe potte* "swollen leg", *potelé* "plump" show remarkably well the general expressive power of a thick lip.

2. The series *planta*, **platta*, **plotta*, as aforesaid, is decidedly secondary. *plautus* "flat-footed" belongs to the root of Skr. *prithu* "broad", Gr. *πλατύς* "flat, broad", Gall. *litano* "broad", Lith. *platus* "broad", etc. *plauta* in Romance is a "sole" (It. *piota*, Prov. *plauta*).

The other two words are Greek borrowings. *πλατύς* at an early period became Latin and underwent the popular reduplication. It is found in all Romance languages. The Low-Greek feminine *πλατύσσα* was also borrowed (**platussa* or **platissa*) as the name of a flat fish, the "plaice", hence Gasc. *platuse*, Catal. *platussa*, O. Fr. *plaiz*, Wall. *pleis*, etc. (Eng. *plaice*). Another kind of flat-fish was called **plotta* (Lomb. *pyota*, Engad. *plotra*) thanks to a folk-etymology which connected with *plattus* the Greek word *τὰ πλωτά* "migratory fish" from Ion. *πλώω* "to float".

The apophony *o-a* of *potta-patta* is surprisingly frequent in the Vulgar Latin onomatopoeias. Very near in meaning to that pair are the pairs:

<i>ciottus</i>	<i>: ciattus</i>
<i>motta</i>	<i>: matta</i>
<i>cioffus</i>	<i>: ciaffus</i>
<i>floccus</i>	<i>: flaccus</i>
<i>maccus</i>	<i>: mocca</i>
<i>baba</i>	<i>: bobba</i>

all referring either to thick conglomerates and to clods, or to movements of the lips.

3. ***ciottus: *ciattus** refers to clods. The former is Rum. *ciot* "knotty excrescence", It. *ciottolo* "pebble", *piede ciotto* "club-foot", Irp. *ciutto* "thick", Mil. *šot* "solid dirt", Fr. *sot* "stupid". The latter is Mil. *šat* "short, stout", Lomb. *šat* "toad", *šat, šata* "son, daughter".

4. ***motta: *matta** "clod". The former generally is used for "clods of earth" or "mounds". It is of obscure origin though often supposed to be Teutonic. The only Germanic representative, however, outside Eng. *moat* borrowed from French is Du. *mot* "clod of turf", a word completely isolated in that language and most probably borrowed. On the other hand **motta* is found in all Romance languages, even in the south of Italy. The meaning does not seem to have been originally confined to clods of earth as in Fr. *motte* but to any sort of clod: Franch. Comt. *motte* "clod of butter", Engad. *motion* "clod of curdled milk", Sp. *mota* "knot in a cloth". It is very important to observe that in Lombardy **motta* means "thick lip" like *potta* of which it appears therefore in origin to have been a variation.

**matta* is found mostly with the meaning that **motta* has in the Jura and the Alps. It refers to "curdled milk", as in Fr. *matte* "junket", *maton* "pancake". Prov. *mat* however means "compact", while Sic. *matta* is a "group".

5. ***cioffus: *ciaffus.** If **motta* reproduces the ending of *potta*, **cioffus* has the initial of **ciottus*, which may be a combination of *potta* and **cioffus*. **cioffus* is "thick, swollen, stupid" and survives in Neapol. *cioffe* "big sledge", O. It. *ciofo* "man from the mob", Istr. *čoubo* "stout man". **ciaffus* is represented by Lucch. *ciaffo* "thick, round face", Sic. *ciaffu* "chubby face", *ciaffalu* "blockhead", Piac. *ciafardu* "thick", Piedm. *ciaferla* "cheek", Low-Engad. *ciaffun* "belly", etc.

6. **floccus: flaccus.** The ending of **cioffus* is found in **loffia* "wind", **guffus* "clumsy", **baffa* "paunch" as well as in **buffare*, **beffare*, **biffare*, referring to wind or breathing. The *f* in all those words suggests breathing or swelling of the lips, void, unsubstantiality. I am inclined to include in that list *flaccus* "slack, flabby", *flaccere* "to wither, to get flaccid", words which Walde very unconvincingly tries to connect with Gr. *βλάψειν* "weak" a derivative from the Ind. E. root *meld* "to

be slack". Less probable yet is the connection between *flocus* "flake" and Gr. *φλαδεῖν* "to tear" (intr.). It is clear enough that *flocus*, referring to flabby, unsubstantial conglomerates, is in apophony with *flaccus*. Both these words being older than those previously studied, there is a possibility that there existed in Latin an old tendency to the onomatopoeic apophony *o-a*.

7. **maceus* "bean broth": **mocca* "grimace of the lips". These words, again connected with the lips, seem to have formed a parallel series to **motta*: **matta* and the other aforesaid onomatopoeias, *maccus* is O. It. *macco*, Sic. *maccu*, Abruzz. *makka* "thick polenta". The word is apparently quite different from Lat. *maccus* "clown, fool", and is most probably a mere onomatopoeia. **mocca* survives in Lomb. *fa la moca* "to put up a lip", *fa di moke* "to fondle with excess", *moka* "vain talk", Fr. *moquer* "to mock", Sp. *mueca* "grimace".

8. **baba*, **babba* "slaver", **bobba* "bean soup, beverage". Of these words, also descriptive of movements of the lips, the former has been very productive in Romance. On the one hand, it survives in It. *bava*, Sard. *baa*, Sp. *baba*, Fr. *bave* "slaver", *bavard* "prattler", *baveuse* (=Sp. *babosa*) "slime-fish", etc.; on the other, in words referring to "babbling", "stammering" (Lat. *babulus*, *babiger*, *babire*) and to childhood and stupidity as Sic. *vava* "infant", *vavaredda* "pupil", It. *babbeo*, *babbione*, *babbalocco* "blockhead", Mil. *babi* "silly", Gen. *baggiu* "ugly-toad", Abruzz. *babbaluke* "cob-web", Sard. *babbayola* "cock-chafer", Sic. *babbalucciu* "snail", Cat. *babo* "earwig", *babolo* "maggot", etc. The bugs, beetles, etc. of this series are all more or less repulsive and have received their names on account of the disgust which our lips express when we behold them. The root still means "lip" in Fr. *babine*, *baboue*, familiar words for "lip", and in Milan. *babi* "chin".

As to **bobba*, it also has various meanings for which the only connecting element is a gesture of the lips. In Abruzz. *bobba*, Milan. Venet. Emil. *boba*, Ital. *bobbia*, it is a "thick soup", a "pap", in Neapol. *bobba*, it is a "hotch-potch", while in Venet. *boba*, it is "pus". On the other hand, in Piedm. *bubu*, Friul. *bobo*, it has the meaning of Fr. *bobo*, a nursery word for "pain, fright", while Friul. *bobo* is "bug-bear", all meanings recalling the names of insects, etc. derived from *baba*, *babba*. As to Sp.

bobo "silly", Sard. *boru* "clumsy", they must be put on a line with *babbione*, *babbalocco*, etc.

Besides *bab* and *bob* existed *bib* referring not to thick, plump objects, but, on the contrary, to small things. It is also used of fright rather than of disgust. It is also a word for small repeated movements and sensations. In Venet. *bibyar*, Friul. *bibya*, it is "to swing", in Canav. *bibyar*, it is "to have one's flesh made to creep". In Triest. *bibioso*, Bresc. *bibus*, the meaning is "a dilatory person". On the other hand, Fr. *bibelots* are "nick-nacks" while Saintong. *bibé* is "to tease".

9. **bombus*, **bambus*, **bimbus*. This series is very close to the preceding one in most of its meanings, though it often also refers to noise. *bombus* is held by Walde to be borrowed from Gr. *βόμβος* "dull sound". This is possible, but both words are onomatopoeic and may have arisen independently. It. *bomba* "bomb", *bombarda* "gun", *ribombare* "to resound", are the only derivatives clearly referring to a dull sound. The other words are used for "swelling, clumsiness, gormandize" etc., and appear to be variations of the *bob*-words: Prov. Cat. *bomba* is "brag", It. *bombero* is a "clumsy man" (cf. *babbione*), while It. *bombo* is a nursery word for "beverage" (cf. *boba*, *bubu*), Sp. *bombare* refers to the same idea, while Prov. *bobanze* "brag", Fr. *bombance* "feasting" are contaminations of this family and that of *bullare* (cf. Meyer-Lübke s. v.; It. *burbanza*).

**bambus* is a more decidedly Latin creation and is clearly a variation of the *bab*-family. It has the same meanings, cf. It. *bambo* "foolish", *baembino* "silly, childlike, child", *bambolo*, *bamboccio* "doll", Sp. *bambolla* "ostentation" (cf. Prov. *bomba*), Gasc. *bamborle* "prattle", Limous. *bamborro* "bass-viol" (cf. It. *bomba*), Sp. *bambarotero* "clamorer", *bambarria* "blockhead".

As to **bimbus*, it shows the diminutive value of the *i* in It. *bimbo* "child", which may be connected in some way with Fr. *bimbelot*, another form of *bibelot*.

On the other hand **bambalare*, **bambare* like the *bib*-family mean "to swing", in Sp. *bamballear*, Norm. *bamboler*, Wallon. *bamber* "to shake one's head", terms that may all be derived from a Vulg. Lat. **bamba*, a word which in origin most prob-

ably is an onomatopoeia of the bell's sound rather than of its movement.

10. ***clocca, *claccare, *cliccare.** If a bell was a *bamba*, it also was a **clocca*. The existence of *clog* "bell", *clogain* "I ring" in Irish induces Sweat and Meyer-Lübke to believe in the Keltic origin of that word. In fact, **clocca* being unknown in Sardinia and Southern Italy is probably not so old as most of the aforesaid onomatopoeias. This however also applies to **claccare* and *cliccare*, sound-reproducing words found in France and Northern Italy: Fr. *cliquer*, "to clank", *cliquette* "clapper", Fr. *claquer* "to clap", Prov. *claca* "to crack, to gossip", Ital. *chiacchierare* "to babble". It seems therefore likely enough that we have to do with an onomatopoeic series which developed pretty late in the West of the Roman Empire, partly under Keltic influence, partly spontaneously.

**clocca* is found in Spain, Northern Italy, and Gaul.

11. ***tliccare, *taccare, *ticcare.** No series better illustrates the principle of onomatopoeic apophony. The three words all mean "to knock" with reference to the slight noise, the slight touch or the slight mark accompanying the knocking. **tuccare* more especially means "to knock" with evocation of a dull noise, hence It. *toccare*, Prov. *tocar*, Fr. *toucher* (Eng. *touch*, cf. Modern French: *toquer*). **ticcare*, like Germ. *ticken*, is used for tapping with a pointed, slightly penetrating object and for the mark left: It. *tecca* "spot", O. Fr. *entechier* "to stain", Mod. Fr. *enticher* "to taint, to infect with". **taccare* refers to a somewhat more perceptible mark: It. *tacca* "notch", Engad. *taccar* "to indent", while Fr. *tache*, Prov. *taca* is "stain". From the meaning "notch, jag", it came to be used for "little hook" (It. *tacco*, *taccone* "patch on the shoe") and for fastening (Fr. *attacher*, It. *attaccare* "attach" *attaccare battaglia* "to join battle, to attack—Sp. *taco* "peg"). In It. *taccagno* "stingy", *taccagnare* "to chaffer", Fr. *taquin* "teasing", one finds the idea of "fastening" extended figuratively to a moral adhesiveness, symbolic of importunity.

12. ***eraccare, croc(it)are, *ericcare.** These are directly imitative words susceptible of being created in the most various languages. **craccare*, which like the Modern French onomato-

poeia *craquer* must have been used for some cracking noise, has come to mean "to spit", a rather vulgar metaphor: It. *scaracchiare*, Prov. *escracer*, Fr. *cracher*. *crocare*, *crocitare* "to caw" is said of crows (It. *crocidare*).

As to **criccare*, its existence in Vulgar Latin is doubtful. It is found in O. Prov. *cricot*, Fr. *criquet* "cricket, locust", *criquer* "to chink", all onomatopoeias that could be fairly recent. On the whole, it is thus unlikely that *craccare*, *croccare*, *criccare* ever constituted a series in Vulgar Latin.

13. *garrio* "to prattle, babble": **gorrus* "hog". The latter survives in O. Fr. *gorre* "sow", Fr. *goret* "young pig", Prov. *gorri* "sucking pig", Sp. *gorrin* "hog". It is a very natural onomatopoeia for pigs. It is, however, not unlikely that *garrio* has influenced the form of this imitative word.

Not very different from the *o-a* apophony is the *u-a* alternation. We find it e. g. in—

14. **juppare*, **joppare*, **jappare*. *juppare* has probably existed in Gaul. O. Fr. *jup* "shout", *juper*, Wallon. *juper* "shout". **joppare* should be the origin of Morv. *joper* "to jump close-legged", Sp. *jopo* "jump" *jope* "hop!". **jappare* "to bark" is confined to Gaul (Prov. *džapa*, Fr. *japper* "to yelp" (Catal. *žaupa*).

15. **jumpare* : **jampare*. As one has *bomb-bamb-bimb* besides *bob*, *bab*, *bib*, one has *jump-jamp* besides *jup-jap*. In fact, the nasalized series is more general in Romance: O. Sard. *iumpare* "to leap", Campid. *giumpai* "to jump", Neapol. *dzumba* "to dance", Prov. *jumpla* "to swing", *jumpladero* "see-saw".

**jampare* is found in Modern Sardinian and is likely to have existed since Roman times besides **jumpare*: Sard. *giampare* "to jump", *giampu* "leap". In spite of the phonetic resemblance, Eng. *jump* seems rather to have a Scandinavian origin. As to the relation of meaning between "shouting" and "jumping", it is made clear enough by the existence of interjections like Span. *jope* (hop!) besides Span. *jopo* "leap". One also finds besides *bombus* "dull noise", **bombitire* (Fr. *bondir*) "to bound".

16. **puppa*, *pappare*, *pipare*. *puppa* is "teat", hence It. *poppa* "breast", *pappare* "to suckle", Fr. *poupe* "breast".

The word is old and most likely refers to the movement of the suckling's lips. *pappare* "to eat" also is a nursery word that is connected with the activity of the lips and mouth. It is Rom. *papa*, Sard. It. *pappare*, O. Fr. *paper*, Fr. *pape* "pap", Sp. *papar*. Besides, Venet. *papota* "thick lips" is a contamination of *pappare* and *potta* (cf. Fr. *papotter* "to babble"). In the same order of ideas, one has: Sp. *papo* "crop", *papado* "double chin", *papudo* "thick-cropped", Portug. *papao* "scarecrow, negro". As *pap* is a very frequent onomatopoeia for eating (cf. Germ. *pappen*), *pip* is no less general for peeping, chirping, whistling (cf. Gr. *πίνως* "young bird", *πιρίζω* "to chirp", Germ. *piepen*, etc.). In Latin one has *pipare*, *piolare*, *pipilare*, *pippitare*, *pipulum*, in Vulgar Latin *pipa* "pipe". (Fr. *pipeau* "shepherd's pipe"). In *pipare* as in **ticcare*, **bibbare*, etc. the *i* stage corresponds thus to the minute form of the movements expressed by the *a-* and *o-u* stages.

17. *bucca*: **biccus*, *biccus*. *bucca* is an onomatopoeia of the swollen cheeks, which prevailed over *os* in Romance (Fr. *bouche*, It. *bocca*, etc.). As to **biccus*, "beak", it is supposed to be Keltic (Gaël. *beic*, Bret. *bec*). The word however is so general in Romance (Sard. *biccu*, Fr. *Prov. bec*, It. *becco*, Sp. *bico*) that it must at an early period have entered the language as an apophony of *bucca* for a thin, pointed buccal opening. **biccus* has also been contaminated with *picare* "to pick", **piccare* "to prick", hence It. *beccare* "to peck".

18. **buffare*, **biffare*, **beffare*, **baffa*. This very complete series refers to movements of the lips connected with breathing and blowing. Swelling is expressed by **buffare* in It. *buffare* "to breathe with swollen cheeks", *buffa* "cowl, hood", Sic. *buffa* "toad", It. *bufera* "blizzard", Fr. *bouffée* "blast of wind", *bouffer* "to puff up", *bouffi* "swollen", *bouffette* "tuft", Wall. *bofe* "pin-cushion", Prov. *bufa* "to blow", *bufet* "bellows", *bufega* "to eat as a glutton" (Mod. Fr. *bouffer*, Cat. *bofet* "box on the ear", Span. *bofe* "lung", etc.) *baff-* has the same value as *buff* in Piedm. *bafra* "paunch", Fr. *bafre* "gluttony", Sic. *baffa* "pumpkin", O. Lomb., Engad. *baffa* "flitch of bacon". On the other hand Cat. *vaf*, Sp. *bafo*, Tosc. *bafore* is "vapor", and, accordingly, Neap. *abbafa* is "to gasp". Both these roots, moreover, refer to mockery as ex-

pressed by swelling of the cheeks and a short blowing (cf. *maccus*: **mocca*), hence: Prov. *bafa* "mockery", Abruzz. *abbafa* "to mock", Sic. *baffari* "to brawl", or from *buf*: It. *buffare* "to play the buffoon", *buffe* "drollery", *buffo* "buffoon". This is the prevalent meaning of *bef*: It. *far beffe* "to mock", *beffa* "mockery", *beffare* "to mock", Fr. *beffer*, Sp. *befar* "to mock", while the connection with "lip" is preserved in Span. *befo* "lower lip of a horse".

As to *biff*, it is probably later and only found in French: *biffer* "to wipe off", *biffe* "rag", *se rebiffer* "to bristle up".

19. **crappa*, **creppa*, *cruppa*. **crappa* "rock, stone", for which Meyer-Lübke does not know any etymology, is apparently a mere onomatopoeia for something rough that scratches, comparable to Du. *krabben* "to scratch", Germ. *krabbeln* "to crawl". It is commonly found in Italian and Rhaetian dialects (Engad. *crap*, Lomb. *crapa*, Judic. *grapa* "skull") alongside of **creppa* (Friul. *krepe* "skull", Triest. *krepi* "rock", It. *greppo* "protruding rock"), Obwald. *grip* "cliff". A similar onomatopoeia has given O. H. G. *klep* "cliff", Dan. *klippe* "crag" etc.

As to *cruppa*, its belonging to this series is doubtful. It is found in C. Gl. II. 118. 16 for a "thick rope" (perhaps on account of its roughness) but the possibility of a borrowing from Teutonic *kruppa* "twisted moss, crop" is not excluded.

20. *ciccum*, *coccum*, *cacare*. This is decidedly a secondary series. *coccum* reproduces Gr. *κόκκος* a grain or seed, as of the pomegranate. It is used largely in Romance for all kinds of shells and husks. (Abruzz. *kokke* "nut", Prov. *koko* "almond", Sard. *cocca* "round bread" etc.). Its use for an "egg" or a "shell" suggests the possibility of a contamination with *cochlea* from Gr. *κοχλίας* "snail". In the language of the people *cochlea* was changed into **cocula*, **cocila* (Meyer-Lübke p. 161), which let it appear as a diminutive of *coccum*. The latter word came thus to mean "shell", in Span. *coca* "mussel" and "egg", in It. *cocco*, while Fr. *coche* is "fragment, potsherd". The disgust inspired by some snails resulted in a contamination with *cacare*, in Prov. *cacarau*, *cacalauso* "snail".

As to *ciccum*, it is used for "the core of a fruit" or, in general, for "trifle". It appears to be a spontaneous creation

from *coccum* for smaller things by application of the *i*-vocalism. It is the source of many a familiar word as It. *chicco* "kernel, bean", *cicca* "bit, stump", Sp. *chico* "small", It. *cica* "trifle", Fr. *chiquet* "small piece", *chiquer* "to eat".

21. **nanna, ninna, nonna.** In *cicum, coccum* (**coccus*), the apophony observable in the "Schallwörter" has been found in a "Lallwort". Another word of the latter category shows the same alteration with even greater clearness; it is a term of endearment applied to both children and old people. The forms in *i*, of course, are the diminutive ones. It. *ninnolo* "toy", O. It. *ninna* "maid", Sp. *niño* "child", *niña* "pupil", It. *ninnare* "to rock a child". *nannus* and *nanna* are generally for old people: Sic. *nannu* "grandfather", Sp. *nana* "housewife", but Tusc. *nannolo* is a "toy", Tusc. *nanna*, a "cradle", Sp. *hacer la nana* "to sleep".

nonna is decidedly for older people: It. *nonna* "grandmother", Sic. *nunna* "mother-match-maker", Log. *nonnu* "godfather", Fr. *nonne* "nun" but Sp. *nono* is "childish". The hesitation between "old man" and "child" is due to the fact that these are words of feeling and mere expressions of sympathy for weaker beings.

II. RHYME-WORDS.

The extension of the ending (or the initial) of words to other words with a similar meaning is especially observable with terms of a picturesque or emotional character. New onomatopoeias are created under the influence of those already existing in the language and haunting our memory.

No wonder then if, in Vulgar Latin, series are found of the same type as Gr. γνάπτω: κάμπτω: κνάπτω—κράξω: κλάξω—Germ. *Ranke, schlank—lügen: betrügen—zucken, rucken, ducken, mucken*, etc.

Sometimes words are actually forged so as to fit into such a series; sometimes they have an independent etymology but have been influenced in their form or their meaning by their being introduced into a group of that kind. Most of the spontaneous formations in which apophony is observable are also illustrations of this process. If there is a family: **potta*, **patta*, **pauta*, there is also a family: **potta*, **motta*, **ciotta* and a family **patta*, **matta*, **ciatta*, both referring to clods and thick

objects. (Compare the English series: *hump, bump, lump, clump.*) To the former group, we ought probably to add **bottia* "hump" (Ital. *bozza* "swelling", Fr. *bosse* "hump"), which appears to be a popular alteration of *botulus, botellus* "bowel" under the influence of **motta*, etc. To the latter series should be added: **platta* "flat" and, in my opinion, **latta* "flat surface", and *stlatta* "broad flat ship". **latta*, to be sure, is generally held to be Teutonic and akin to German *Laden* but both words, in fact, are very obscure and the connection between them is not clear. Moreover, **latta* is common in all Romance languages and its original meaning is not "lath" but "flat piece of metal or wood" as shown by It. *latta* "thin plate", Port. *lata* "plate of metal", O. Sp. *hoja de lata* "plate of brass". **latta* is thus, most probably, a slangy form of *lata* "wide and flat" with the popular reduplication so often found in those vulgar words (cf. above: **patta, platta, plotta, *babba, puppa*, etc.) and notably in *stlatta* "broad ship", a doublet of **latta*.¹

Another series depicting swelling, wind, void is represented by **guffus* "thick, plump", **cioffus* "thick, clumsy", **buffare* "to swell, to blow", **ex-bruffare* "to gulp, to gush forth", **loffia* "wind, part", and perhaps *offa* "clod of meal", **muffa* "mockery". (Sp. *mofa* "disdain", Engad. *mofla* "swollen cheek", Hennuy. *mustu* "paunched").

Several dull noises are expressed by a *-utt-* series: *gutta* "drop",² **jutta* "broth" (Engad. *giuota* "barley soup", Parm. *dzota* "liquid food for pigs", Poitev. *žut* "pap for geese"), *muttum* "mutter" (It. *motto*, Fr. *mot*) and possibly **ciuttus* "young lamb" (Engad. *čut* "lamb", Borm. *šotin* "sheep").

There are, moreover, guttural series. One is in *-ucca* representing also dull noises as *bucca* "swollen cheeks, mouth", **mucca* "cow" (It. *mucca* "cow", Romagn. *moka* "milch cow"), **buccare* "to shout with a low voice" (Fr. *hucher*, Prov. *ucar*, Fr. *huchet* "hunting horn", Prov. *uca* "herald", Cat. *ahucar* "to frighten by shouting"), **tuccare* "to knock" (cf. supra). To those words we ought to add **guccius* "dog"

¹ C. Gl. L. II. 188. 50—Gr. L. VII. 107. 1. K.—Cf. Festus 454: "genus navigii latum magis quam altum et a latitudine sic appellatum".

² Walde vainly tries to find an etymology for that onomatopoeia.

(Sp. *gozque*, Wall. *go*, Sic. *guttsu*, It. *cuccio*) and **cuccinus* "pig" (Rum. *cucciu*, Fr. *cochon*, Sp. *cocho*, etc.).

Another in *-icculus* refers to small things: **piccus* "point, small" (Rum. *pic* "drop", Megl. *pica* "a little", It. *piccolo* "small", *picco* "point", *piccare* "to prick", etc.), *cicum* "core of a fruit, trifle" (cf. supra), **ticca* "spot" (cf. supra).

On the other hand, a good many words ending in *-occus* refer to rough things: **roccus*, **rocca* "rock" (It. *rocca*, Fr. *roche*, *roc*, etc.), **froccus* "rough, uncultivated field" (O. Fr. *froc*, Sp. *llueco*), *broccus* "jagged, indented" (It. *brocco* "pointed stick", *brocca* "stake", Neap. *vrocca* "fork", Fr. *broche* "spit", Bologn. *broca* "bough", etc.), three words without etymology, which most likely are onomatopoeias. They rhymed with *occa* "harrow", an Indo-European word, and **söccus* "plowshare", which has changed the *u* of Gall. *sukkos* apparently under the influence of *bröccus*, *öcca*, etc.

A curious group of words in *-uppa*, of varying origin, refers to ropes, strings, and similar objects. Among them is **faluppa* "filament, thread, rod" a widely used term in Romance where it is applied to all kinds of rods, rags, strings, wraps, etc., and is notably the origin of both Fr. *envelopper* and Fr. *frapper*. *cruppa* is a "thick rope" (cf. supra), **stuppa* (Gr. *στύπη* "tow") means "raw flax" (Fr. *étoupe*), while **marsuppa* from Gr. *μάρπιτος* "bag" has altered its ending to enter this series (O. L. *marsupium*). It has also come to mean "porpoise" by metaphor (Sp. *marsopa*).

III. THE SUFFIXES: { *-ittus*, *-attus*, *-ottus*, *-icculus*, *-accus*, *-occus*.

The two categories of phenomena considered in this article have, in my opinion, a direct bearing on the history of the mysterious diminutive suffixes of Vulgar Latin.

In spite of various attempts at explanation, the suffixes *-ittus* and *-icculus*, so productive in Romance and important even in familiar Latin, have an obscure origin. A. Horning (Zeit. Rom. Ph. XIX. 170-188, XX. 335-353) has made a list of the examples of *-icculus* and *-ittus* in inscriptions. He considers both suffixes as alterations of *-iculus* in the mouth of children. Meyer-Lübke (Einführung Rom. Sp. p. 184, sqq.) rather inclines to assign a foreign origin to those endings. *-icculus*, he

thinks, is Keltic on account of *Bodicca* CIL. VIII. 2877, *Aveticcos* CIL. XIII. 190, etc., while *-ittus* was introduced from Teutonic by soldiers who heard the Germanic mercenaries using familiar names as *Charietto* instead of *Chari-bertus*, *Chari-winnus*, etc. (cf. Germ. *Kunz*, *Heinz* from *Konrad*, *Heinrich*, etc.). Zimmermann (Zeit. R. Ph. XXVIII. 343), on the contrary, believes in the Latin origin of *-ittus* and considers it as a doublet of *-itus*. None of these explanations is absolutely convincing. It may be, however, that they all contain some truth.

We have seen that the elaboration of a suffix of some picturesque or emotional character is a complex process. The success of an ending as a means of expression of that kind is due always to two causes: the natural expressive value of the sounds which has a tendency to render them popular and suggestive and the influence of other words or other endings that are associated with similar feelings, similar impressions. These influences are often various but agree in connecting some sound-complex with the same meaning.

Another character of these emotional suffixes, is the facility with which they are extended. They correspond, not to an intellectual category, but to a state of mind. Whenever the same emotion is experienced by the speaker, the suffix is presented to his mind by a mere association of sensations. This accounts especially for the profusion of diminutive suffixes in many languages. They answer to a sympathetic, affectionate or ironical mood, they are expressive of a "modus sentiendi".

The starting-point of such suffixes often is surprisingly inconspicuous. *-ouille* in French has become depreciative probably on account of *sucula* and *suculare* > *souiller* "to soil". Later suffixes have acquired emotional properties in that way: *alia* has become depreciative on account of a few collectives as *canalia*, *putealia* in which the suffix was infected by compromising contact. In the same way *aceus*, *icius*, *ocius*, *ucius* have acquired special shades of meaning in Italian (and partly in French). They properly have the value of Engl. *-ish* and *-like*: *vinaceus* = "winelike", *melaceus* = "honey-like" but Fr. *vinasse*, *mélasse*, etc., now mean: "poor wine, mock honey", etc. Engl. *-ish* has at times developed in the same direction. Such is also the history of *-aster* of *viridaster*. "greenish", which

becomes highly deprecative in *matraster* > *marâtre*, *filiaster* (C. I. L. XIII.) "bastard". The vocalic symbolism has, of course, discretely influenced those evolutions. *a*-suffixes are generally flatly deprecative, *o*-, *u*-suffixes suggest clumsiness, thickness together with depreciation, *i*-suffixes more and more become diminutives.

By contrast with *-on*, which is deprecative and augmentative, *inus* becomes diminutive: *sub hoc signino* CIL. XII. 874; *scutrinum* "little plate" C. Gl. L. 515. II; *domnina* CIL. II. 1836; and, moreover, *collina*, *pectorina*, *narina*, *radicina*, *pecorina*, *pullicinum*, **nugina*, **absina*, *circinus*, etc. (cf. Meyer-Lübke, s. v.), *rapina* "turnip" VI. 2104 (Olcott 136), *buccina* (Olcott 135).

This diminutive value is also applied to adjectives: Span. *bonina* "daisy", It. *Bellini* (proper name), It. *piccino* (= *piccolo*), etc. A Pompeian inscription (IV. 1405) has *pusina* for *pusilla*, while *pucina* "small" is quoted by Olcott p. 135.

Now besides *-inus*, there was a suffix *-innus*, which was more expressive of endearment and which was obtained by applying to *-inus* the popular reduplication of consonants so often found in imitative and emotional words: of **piccus* "small" (Rum. *pic* "drop", Megl. *pica*, "a little"), one had not only the diminutives **picculus* and **piccinus* but also **piccinnus*, preserved in Sard. *piccinnu*, Tarent. *piccinnu*, Sp. *pequeño* (= **peccuinnus*). Of *pit-* and *pits-*, nursery words for "small" (It. *pizza* "point", *pizzo* "tuft of beard") one had *pitsinnus* in O. Sard. (Log.) *pithinnu*, Gallur. *pitsinnu*. One also had **putinnus* or **put-sinnus* from *putus* "boy" in Rum. *putin* (besides *putillus*, Walde p. 627), *pipinna* "parva mentula" (Walde p. 586). The same ending existed in the familiar word *cinnus* "wink" (It. *cenno*, Sp. *ceño*), a kind of parallel formation to *cicum* "trifle" with the diminutive ending *-iccus* (cf. infra), perhaps under influence of *cincinnus* "lock of hair" (*κικύννος*).

Now, there are other suffixes than *-inus* and those already mentioned, which had in Vulgar Latin a shade of familiarity. Zimmermann is probably right in assigning such value to *-atus*, *-itus*, *-utus* used for adjectives. Properly, of course, those endings are those of the past participles which had the greatest extension in the popular speech. They early came to be used to form all kinds of new adjectives: *auritus*, *crinitus*, *pellitus*—

barbatus, **fatatus*, *exauguratus*,—*canutus*, *cornutus*, **car-nutus*, etc. Thus these endings became more or less typical of the familiar speech and came to be applied even to preexisting adjectives. *bellus*, e. g. had a familiar form: **bellatus* preserved in the comparative: **bellatior*>O. Fr. *bellezor*, while the form that prevailed in Spain was *bellitus*>O. Span. *belido*, Port. *velido*. Besides *russus* e. g., existed *russatus* (CIL. 10062) properly a participle of *russare*, but in appearance a variation of *russus*.¹ Besides *bimus*, existed *bimulus* (CIL. VI. 16739) and *bimatus* (CIL. VI. 28910). It would have been only normal that in proper names and in adjectival terms of endearment, *atus* and *itus* should have developed into *attus*, *ittus*.

Now, in fact, it is in such terms that we first find the ending *-itta*. It is used in inscriptions for names of women as *Suavitta*, *Caritta*, *Bonitta* derived from *suavis*, *cara*, *bona*,² in a "Lallwort" as *Attitta*, or in *Julitta*, *Levitta*, *Gallitta*, diminutives of *Julia*, *Livia*, *Galla*. Gradually the ending is found in masculine names and in all kinds of nouns. Its much greater extension as compared with that of *-itus* is explainable especially by the sound-symbolic value of the *i* and the *tt* and also by the influence of the verbal frequentative and diminutive suffix *-itare*, which frequently appears as an equivalent of *-illare*, *-ulare* in the same way as *-ittus* is found in competition with *-ulus*, *-illus*. One has e. g. in imitative words: *pipitare* besides *pipilare*, *pipare*, "to peep, to chirp", *crocitare* "to caw" (It. *crocidare*), besides *crociare*, *graccitare* besides *gracillare* "to cackle", *hippitare* (C. Gl. L. V. 601. 18) "to sob", besides *hippare* (Sp. *hipar*), etc. That same influence seems to have produced a diminutive ending *-itus* before *-ittus* prevailed, cf. in Petronius *caccitus* "fine boy" (Walde p. 104) besides *cacus* "servant of the officers in the army" and in *amita* "aunt", besides the "Lallwort" *amona* "mother".³ The Teutonic *-etta* of *Charietta* (cf. supra) may also have helped to make such endings popular among soldiers but our study of the rhyme-words will, I hope, have created in the reader the con-

¹ Cf. a long list of *-aius* formations in Olcott p. 247.

² Grandgent, Inter. Vulg. L. p. 20.—Of that type are preserved *bellitta* in Fr. *belette*, O. Sic. *bilottulu* "weasel", and *birritta* (*birrus* "red") in It. *berretta* "cap".

³ In *cucurbita*, also, *ita* was understood as a diminutive suffix, as shown by the substitution of *ula*, *illa* for *ita* in Lyon. *curla*, Langued. *cugurlo*.

viction that nothing can have helped the spreading of *-ittus* so much as the hitherto unobserved circumstance that *-ittus* happened to be the ending of several "Lallwörter" referring to smallness. Among them was **pittus*, a nursery word for "small", preserved in **pitinnus* (cf. *supra*) **pitittus* (Fr. *petit*), **piticus* (Sard. *pitiku*) **pitinus* (Mil. *pitin* "little"). **tetta*, another nursery word, was a "teat". *hitta* or *hetta* was a "trifle", a "pellicle". Perhaps even **citto* (It. *cetto*, Sard. *kitto*) "quickly, fast" for *cito*, and **pettia* "piece, bit" (Keltic in origin?), may have helped in associating *-itt* *-ett* with shortness, smallness, etc.

As to *-iccus*, found under the same conditions as *-ittus*: *Bonica* CIL. VIII. 4560, *Karica* ib. 3288, but more in Spain and Africa, its history is probably not very different from that of *-ittus*, except that the foreign influence here is probably much more important. In Spain e. g. where *-icus* is very frequent it is certainly a Celtiberian patronymic ending. *icus*, however, has also Latin origins. That it may have developed from *-iculus* is, of course, possible though not demonstrable and hardly probable. A familiar reduplication of the suffix *-icus* with a shifting of accent under the influence of *-ittus* and the Keltic *-iccos* is much more probable because *-icus* in the popular speech had become a diminutive ending:

- **gemellicus* "twin" (Sard. *amedigga*, Sp. *emelgo*).
- **murica* "mouse" (Prov. *mурго*).
- **petrica* "stone" (Prov. *peirego* "hail").
- **novica* "small boat" (Prov. *nauc* "trough", O. Fr. *no* "cophin").
- **cutica* "skin, film" (Lomb. *codega*).
- **retica* "sieve" (Wall. *reš*).
- **ramica* "rung of a ladder" (Fr. *ranche*).

As a medium between *-icus* and *-iccus*, *-icus* is found in: **narica* "nostril" (It. *narice*), a parallel form to **narina* (Fr. *narine*), *panicum* "millet" from *panus* "bunch of millet" (Walde p. 558) and in **burricus* "pony", besides **burriccus* (meaning properly "little red" from *burrus* "red"). Meyer-Lübke, p. 106.

-iccus is thus a variation of *-icus* and *-iclus*, due not only to a general tendency to reduplication and to the influence of *-ittus* but to the existence of several frequent familiar words in *-iccus*

referring to smallness. The aforesaid **piccus* is, like **pittus*, a children's word for "small" (Calabr. *pikka* "little", Rum. *piciu* "baby") and for "point" (It. *picco* "peak", Sp. *pico* "beak"). Besides **piccus* also existed **miccus* (Rum. *mic*) perhaps influenced by Gr. *μικρός* (Densusianu, Hist. L. Roum. I. 201). We have seen that *cicum* "core of a fruit, trifle" is apparently an apophony of *coccum* "kernel, egg". The word was used for "small", cf. Span. *chico* "small", Catal. *zech*, Fr. *chiquet* "small piece". It. *cica* is a "trifle". Moreover, **ticca* was a little spot (It. *tecca*) and **biccus* a "beak" (cf. supra).

The endings *-ittus*, *-iccus* existed also in Vulgar Latin with the vocalism in *a* and *o* (or *u*). These alterations, of course, are due to the symbolic value of these vowels, to the pattern of *-acius*, *-icius*, *-ocius*, *-ucius*, *-atus*, *-itus*, *-otus*, *-utus*, but more yet to the existence in onomatopoeias and familiar words of the *a-i-o-u* apophony that we have followed in quite a number of examples. Besides **pittus* "small, pointed" existed *potta*, **patta* referring to thick or clumsy things. Besides **ticca* existed **tacca* and **tucca* with variations of meanings less marked but perceptible. Is it then astonishing that *-attus*, *-ottus*, *-accus*, *occus*, *uccus* developed by the side of *ittus* and *iccus*? *-attus* is deprecative and refers to animals: **verrattus*, **corbattus*, **cervattus* (O. Fr. *corbat*, *cervat*, Fr. *verrat* "boar-pig"). In some way, they rhyme with **patta* "paw" while **pissatum* "urine of cattle" rhymes with **bratta* "dirt" (Gen. *brata*, Ital. *imbrattare* "to soil", *sbrattare* "to clean"), *-ottus* similarly rhymed with *potta*, **motta*, **ciotta*, etc. Like *-accus*, *-occus*, *-uccus*, it was only moderately used in Vulgar Latin. The shades of meaning are generally better preserved in Italian (Meyer-Lübke Gramm. II) than in French where *-ottus*, e. g. is simply diminutive. *occa*, *ucca* in French are only sporadically found: *épinocche* (**spinocca*) "stickle-back", *mailloche* "beetle", Lieg. *biloc* (*bulluca*) "small apple", propr. "small ball", etc. The antiquity of *-occus* is shown by the existence of Sard. *piccioccu* "small".

The formation and the extension of the suffixes *-ittus*, *-attus*, *-ottus*, *-iccus*, *-accus*, *-occus* is a striking proof of the importance of apophonic and rhyming tendencies in the development of those elements of Vulgar Latin vocabulary which have freed themselves from tradition.

These tendencies ought thus to be taken into account in any etymological research dealing with Latin words especially when one has to do with familiar terms or with words referring to country life. And since such tendencies are deeply rooted in the mentality of the speakers, it is obvious that they are still active in the Romance languages and should never be neglected by Romance scholars.

I hope that this article may be useful not only for its general conclusion but also for the etymologies proposed in it for a good many *cruces* among the substrata of Romance words, such as **patta* and *potta*, **potta* and **motta*, *maccus* and **mocca*. A new interpretation is given of *flaccus* and *floccus*. The onomatopoeic character of these words (at least partly) has been emphasized as it has been for *cicum*, *coccum*, *cinnus*, *gutta*, **jutta*, **jumpare*, **froccus* and *broccus*. Strange words as **rocca*, **greppa*, **crappa*, have been treated as merely imitative while possible borrowings as **clocca*, **biccus* have been shown to have penetrated into Latin as members of preexisting series. A foreign origin, on the other hand, has been denied to **latta* as well as to **patta* and **mottus* in spite of the current opinion.

Certainty, of course, is not attainable in the study of such obscure elements of language and probably better explanations will sometime be proposed for several among the words I have mentioned. The principle, however, will hold good and further research, undoubtedly, will result in emphasizing the importance of these phenomena, which, though not quite unnoticed, are far from having hitherto received due attention on the part of Romance scholars.

ALBERT J. CARNOY.

UNIVERSITIES OF LOUVAIN AND PENNSYLVANIA.

III.—THE PROSECUTION OF LIFELESS THINGS AND ANIMALS IN GREEK LAW.

[CONCLUDED FROM A. J. P. XXXVIII 175.]

PART II.

As for the management of the Prytaneum court, the old question so long discussed as to whether the fifty-one judges known as the ephetae had charge of it,¹ and the discrepancy in two statements of Pollux, who in one passage (VIII, 90) says the King-archon, but in another (VIII, 120) the phylobasileis or tribe-Kings, were in charge, have been settled by an authoritative statement in the recently discovered Constitution of Athens of Aristotle, to the effect that both King and tribe-Kings judged.² Thus though the ephetae, in charge of the homicide courts at the Palladium, Delphinium and Phreatto, were in course of time replaced by popular, i. e. heliastic, jurors appointed by lot,³ in all probability the court of the Prytaneum,

¹ Poll. VIII 120, and Harpocrat. s. v. *ἔφέται*, state that those officials sat at the Prytaneum. Their mistake probably grew out of the fact that their source, Demosth. 23, 65–77, juxtaposed the five murder courts; cf. Busolt, Griech. Gesch. II³ 234, n. 2. J. Miller, Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopädie, V, p. 1653 (art. *Drakon*).

² 57. 4. Lipsius, Sitzungsber. der sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss., Phil.-Historische Classe, 1891, pp. 41–52, was the first to point out that the King and tribe-Kings acted together. For the older discussion see Philippi, *Der Areopag und die Epheten* (1874), p. 18 sq.

³ Aristotle, 57. 4 speaks of *οἱ λαχόντες* having charge of the three courts mentioned in his day; the word *ἔφέται* however does not appear in the MS. of his work but has been inserted by Kenyon (Suppl. Aristotelicum, III, Pt. II, p. 67), being taken from Harpocration, s. v. *ἔφέται*, who, he supposes, took it from Aristotle. Others believe *οἱ λαχόντες* exclude the word *ἔφέται*; thus Kaibel, *Stil und Text der Πολ. Αθ.* des Aristoteles, 240, supplies *ἄνδρες* instead, while Gilbert, *Staatsaltert.*³ I, 424, n. 2, supplies *δικασταὶ* or *ἡλιασταὶ*; Lipsius, op. cit. 130, no. 30, also is against inserting *ἔφέται*. But it may be said in favor of *ἔφέται* that Demosthenes, a contemporary of Aristotle, speaks of them in murder trials in his day: 23. 38.

owing to the fact that its competence was limited to rare cases of a ceremonial character, never had anything to do with them and its judges were not so replaced.¹ The King-archon, therefore, true to his inheritance,² had the presidency of the court of the Prytaneum, as he did of all other homicide trials.³

Whether the court before which, according to the general assumption based on the amnesty law of Solon,⁴ trials of conspiracy against the State (*τυραννίς*) were tried, was identical with the court under discussion cannot be finally decided with our present knowledge. That the word “*καταδικασθέντες*” used in the passage of Plutarch cited refers to the companions of Cylon, who in 612 B. C. seized the Acropolis with the intention of setting up a tyranny,⁵ is generally assumed. In another passage Plutarch says the remnants of the conspirators, still under pollution, were persuaded by Solon to be tried by a court of 300 nobles and that all were found guilty and exiled, even the bones of the dead being dug up and scattered beyond the borders.⁶ Many scholars believe this decision was handed down by the Areopagus,⁷ and that all such trials were heard

¹ So Miller, p. 1652. But Lipsius, pp. 20-1, believes down to Solon's time they sat in all five courts of homicide; on p. 27, n. 85 (cf. p. 131), he says they may have sat at the Prytaneum even down to Aristotle's day, when finally they were replaced by the King-archon and tribe-Kings.

² After the passing of royalty the royal name was retained as *Ἄρχων βασιλέως*, since on him devolved the sacred rites inseparably connected with the name of King, i. e. charge of the Eleusinian mysteries, the Lenaea, Anthesteria, sacrifices, games, etc.; Aristot. 57, 1, Poll. VIII, 90; cf. Demosth. 35, 48; 39, 9. The eponymous archon, on the other hand, had the guardianship of orphans, widows, heiresses, etc.—a sort of Lord Chancellor of Athens; see Demosth. 35, 48 (law, 43, 75), Arist. 56. 6; etc.

³ Arist. 57. 2; cf. Bekk., Anecd. graec. 310, 6 sq.; Harpocrat. Phot. Suidas, s. v. *ἡγεμονία δικαστηρίου*; etc.

⁴ Plut. Solon, 19 (=Solon's 13th table) πλὴν δοι ἐκ τυραννελού *καταδικασθέντες* ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ τυραννίδι. Here the word-order shows that cases of tyranny were tried at a prytaneum; cf. Andoc. I, 78. On the amnesty law see Philippi, *Das Amnestiegesetz des Solon und die Prytanen der Naukraren zur Zeit des Kylonischen Aufstandes*, Rhein. Mus. XXIX (1874), p. 18 sq.

⁵ Herod. V. 71; Thucyd. I, 126; etc.

⁶ Solon, 12.

⁷ e. g. Lipsius, op. cit. p. 23, following the earlier opinion of Westermann, Ber. d. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. 1849, p. 151 sq.; Gleue, De

there. Others, like Keil,¹ speak for the identity of the two courts, while still others, as Busolt,² leave the question in doubt. It is of importance to us in our later discussion of the age of the Prytaneum trials. It would seem impossible to get any other meaning out of the words “*ινώ τὸν βασιλέων*” than to refer them to the tribe-Kings who were in charge of the Prytaneum court.

Down to the fourth century B. C. the courts at the Palladium (for the trial of unpremeditated murder) and Delphinium (for lawful homicide) seem to have kept their importance.³ Though in early times the Prytaneum court also, because of its religious character, may have been important, yet, like the court at the Phreatto (where those banished for murder and accused a second time were tried), it must have lost gradually its influence. In Aristotle's day, it still continued, as we have seen, under the old religious supervision of the King-archon and his associates. However, in his *Politics*, Aristotle makes no mention of it in his enumeration of eight necessary courts, which shows it had outgrown its usefulness.⁴ In primitive days, when men held

homicidarum in Areopago Atheniensi iudicio (Diss. Inaug. Göttingen, 1894), p. 10 sq., who followed Stahl, *Rhein. Mus.* XLVI (1891), p. 481 sq., who based the theory on a statement to that effect in a schol. on Aristoph. *Equit.* 445. Lipsius, p. 131, believes the prytaneum of the amnesty law was an ancient court, no longer known to us, which had to do with the *πυράρεις* of the naucrarias, and so different from the Prytaneum court under discussion. He believes it may have sat at the Prytaneum, which was an official seat (cf. Arist. *Constit.* 3. 5), and that it was composed of nine archons sitting with the basileus as president. Aristotle, *Constit.* 8. 4, says the Areopagus tried conspirators against the State under a law of impeachment which Solon enacted concerning such offenses. He is certainly referring to his day.

¹ Solon. *Verfass.* p. 108 sq.; cf. von Schöffer (quoted by Miller, *Pauly-Wissowa*, V, p. 1653); Bötticher, l. c., p. 347. Photius, s. v. *ναυκρατία*, says Solon found the Prytaneum in existence; cf. also *Etym. Magn.* 395, 50.

² *Griech. Staats- und Rechtsalt.*, 160.

³ So Busolt, *Griech. Staats- und Rechtsalt.* (Müller's *Handbuch* IV, 1), p. 273, who thinks all the homicide courts were limited in the fourth century.

⁴ IV. 2-4, p. 1300 b. In this passage he mentions, though disparagingly, the court of the Phreatto: “There may be a fourth court in which murderers who have fled from justice are tried after their return; such as the court of the Phreatto is said to have been at Athens. But cases of this sort rarely happen at all even in large cities” (Jowett).

animistic conceptions of nature, trials of lifeless things must have had a greater importance. They were retained chiefly for conservative religious reasons until, by Aristotle's day, they had become almost ceremonial in character, a species of mock trial.¹ The four Ionic gentile tribes of Attica, dating from the remotest antiquity,² had gradually lost all political significance and their chiefs finally retained only religious functions. Sitting in judgment at these ceremonial trials was probably their last function historically.³ However, this court, like that held at the Phreatto, seems never to have been formally abrogated down to the end of antiquity, if we can trust the evidence of Pausanias.⁴

Before discussing the origin of the ideas at the base of these trials, let us briefly consider whether any accounts of the trials at the Prytaneum have come down to us. The only example known to me of the first case—the trial of an unknown murderer—is found in the oration of the pseudo-Demosthenes⁵

¹ All modern scholars speak of the ceremonial character of these trials: e. g. Philippi, op. cit. p. 16; Busolt, op. cit. p. 273; Schömann, Griech. Alterthümer⁶ (ed. Lipsius), 1897, I, p. 512: "Endlich beim Prytaneion wurde nicht sowohl ein wirkliches Gericht gehalten als vielmehr eine religiöse Ceremonie vorgenommen"; Pauly-Wissowa, II, p. 284, s. v. *ἀψέχων δικαίοις*; Gilbert, p. 430; Lipsius, p. 131; Smith, Dict. Antiq. art. Prytaneum; E. Curtius, Stadtgesch. p. 302; etc.

² The population was originally divided into four tribes (*φυλαί*), viz.: Geleontes, Hopletes, Aegicores and Argades, presided over by kings. Aristotle (Const. 41, 2), in enumerating eleven changes in the Athenian constitution before his day, says the people in the days of Ion were divided into tribes and chose kings. The functions as well as the origin of these kings are little known: they probably from the first enjoyed both religious and legal functions, especially the supervision of sacrifices (so Pollux, VIII, 111) like the Roman *rex sacrificulus*; cf. Livy, 2. 2. 1, 6. 41. 9. See Aristot. Fragn. 349 and cf. Busolt, op. cit. p. 273.

³ Cf. Keil, op. cit. p. 108 f.; and n. 76; Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I, p. 94 sq.; Lipsius, p. 25, n. 81. In the fourth century we hear of the cost of certain offerings being paid from their treasury: Bull. corr. hell. III, 69; Hermes, XIV, p. 507. We know Solon retained the old tribes as the base of his constitution. Comp. Aristotle, Const. 8. 3, who also mentions that there were still four *phylobasileis*. That they led a shadowy existence even in Clisthenes' time is shown by an inscription: C. I. A. II, 844.

⁴ 1. 28. 10.

⁵ Orat. 47. The loose and feeble style of this speech makes it almost certain that it was not written by Demosthenes, but by a contemporary.

against Euergus and Mnesibus. This was a proceeding against the defendants for having given false testimony in a trial between the plaintiff and Theophemus, a brother of Euergus. In the plaintiff's absence from home, the defendants had entered the apartment of his wife and children, and in attempting to steal certain articles of furniture, had so injured an aged freedwoman who resisted them, that she died in six days. After her death the plaintiff went to the legal interpreters¹ to learn what course of action to pursue. They stated the law and also advised, that inasmuch as he was not present at the murder and had no other witnesses than his wife and children, "not to make proclamation against anyone by name, but generally against those who had perpetrated the deed and committed the murder".² The case does not, however, seem to have come up for trial at the Prytaneum, for the man was also advised to bear his misfortune as patiently as possible and to perform the necessary religious ceremonies. Of the third case—the trial of animals—so far as I am aware there are no examples known, and, if we except the trial of the axe of the first ox-slayer, none of the second. However, that there were similar courts of procedure against inanimate things in other parts of the Greek world, is evidenced by a few examples, though they are vouched for by late writers. This shows that the same primitive animistic conceptions of nature were characteristic of the Greek mind generally.³

Perhaps the best instance of such a trial is that of the statue of the Olympic victor Theagenes on the island of Thasos.⁴

¹ *Ἐπηγγυατορι*, § 68. They were expounders at Athens of the sacred rites and customs and of the laws, like the Roman "interpres religionum". Cf. Aristotle, *Constit.* 11, 1 (*ἴξηγεισθατ*); Isaeus, 73. 24; Plato, *Euthyph.* 4 D and 9 A; *Laws*, 759 C-E and 775 A; etc.

² § 69.

³ We know the murder procedure of Athens was imitated by other Greek states: Isocrates, *Panegyr.* 40; cf. Gilbert, p. 535; Lipsius, p. 619; etc.

⁴ Theagenes, son of Timosthenes, later because of his exploits called the son of Heracles, won in boxing in Ol. 75 (= 480 B. C.) and in the pancratium in Ol. 76 (= 476 B. C.). He also won three times in boxing at Delphi, nine times in boxing and once in the pancratium at the Isthmus and nine times in boxing at Nemea. He also won the stadium at Phthia and is said to have won 1400 crowns in all (*Paus.* 6. 11. 5; or

Pausanias recounts how a former enemy of the victor used to come each night after his death and scourge his statue as if he were punishing Theagenes himself. At last the statue checked his insolence by falling upon and killing him. The man's sons prosecuted it for murder, and it was found guilty and cast beyond the borders, i. e. into the sea. The lands of the Thasians became unfruitful and they were advised by the Delphian oracle to bring back their exiles. This they did but the dearth kept up. A second time they were advised: "But you have forgotten your great Theagenes." They did not know how to recover the statue, but finally it was caught in a net by some fishermen and brought ashore. Then it was set up in its old place in the agora, where Pausanias says they still in his day sacrificed to it as to a god.¹ Several similar examples occur in Greek literature, but this seems to be the only case in which an actual trial and condemnation are recorded.²

Having discussed, then, the nature of the trials held at the Prytaneum, let us consider whether any data exist from which

1200, according to Plut. *Praecept. reipubl. gerend.* 15). See on Theagenes, Paus. 6. 11. 2-9: Förster, *Die Sieger in den Olymp. Spielen*, Nos. 191, 196; Hyde, *de Olymp. stat.* (Halle, 1903), No. 4; etc.

¹ VI. 11. 9: he says the victor's statue was set up in many places in Greece and honored by the natives as able to heal diseases. Lucian, *Deor. concil.* 12, also says the statue at Thasos cured fevers like the one of Polydamas at Olympia. Athenagoras says, *Supplic. pro Christ.* 14, p. 62 (Otto), the Thasians worshipped it as a god. See on such worship, Rohde, *Psyche*, I. p. 181; Ukert, *Ueber Dämonen, Heroen und Genien* (Abhandl. d. k. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. Phil.-histor. Cl. II (1850), pp. 139, sq., esp. 183), and Gerhard, *Ueber Wesen, Verwandtschaft und Ursprung d. Dämonen und Genien* (Abhandl. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, Phil.-histor. Cl. 1852, pp. 237-66); etc. The story of Theagenes' trial is told also by Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* XXXI, 618 R. 340 M. (Teubner I, p. 377), and is mentioned by Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* V. 34, p. 231 c, d, 232 a. Dio Chrysostom, I. c., formulates the Thasian law, an almost exact duplicate of the Athenian.

² Thus the statue of the Olympic victor Euthymus of Locri, who won in boxing in Ols. 74 (484 B. C.), 76, 77 (476-472 B. C.); see Paus. VI, 6, 4 (and VI, 11, 4); Förster, Nos. 185, 195, 207; Hyde, No. 56. Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* v. 34, p. 232 b, d, tells a story about his statue almost exactly like the one about Theagenes. Another example is that of the bronze ox of Philesius at Olympia, set up as a votive offering of the Corcyraeans, which caused the death of a small boy, who, while playing beneath it, suddenly raised his head, and broke it against the belly of the ox: Paus. V. 27, 9-10; cf. X. 9. 3.

we can form an idea of the origin of the court. Pausanias, in mentioning the similar court at Thasos, says that the Thasians in their laws about lifeless things followed those of Draco at Athens.¹ In another passage already quoted, however, he connects the trials of inanimate things at Athens with the festival of the Diipolia, which he says goes back to the royal period.²

As we have seen we can get no proof for the date of origin from the court of the ephetae, which many scholars, following Pollux,³ believe was instituted by Draco, for we have seen that there is no good reason for thinking these judges ever had to do with the Prytaneum. And even if it were clear that they had, too much doubt has been cast on the statement of Pollux that Draco founded the ephetae, to help us in dating the origin of these trials.⁴ So we must look elsewhere for guidance in solving the problem.

K. Bötticher has made an ingenious argument to show that the court dates back to prehistoric times.⁵ Since Pollux says the phylobasileis sat in council in the King's palace near the Bucoleum,⁶ and we learn from other sources that the Bucoleum was near the Prytaneum,⁷ we know these buildings were in the immediate neighborhood of one another. Furthermore, inas-

¹ 6. 11. 6. The same statement is also made by the Schol. on Aeschylus, *Septem*, 179.

² I. 28. 10.

³ VIII. 125; cf. Timaeus, *Lex. Plat.* 127.

⁴ Philippi was the first to cast doubt on Pollux's statement by showing he may have gotten the mistake from a wrong reading of a passage in Demosthenes, 43. 57, and so he was against the idea that Draco had to do with the founding of the court of the ephetae: see N. Jahrb. f. cl. Phil. CV (1872), pp. 578 and 604 sq.; cf. *Der Areopag und die Epheten*, p. 138 sq. He was followed by Lange, *Die Epheten u. der Areopag von Solon*, p. 3 sq.; Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, I. 479. 1; and recently by Miller, *Pauly-Wissowa*, V, p. 2825. Schömann, N. Jahrb. f. cl. Phil. CXI (1875), p. 153, and recently Gilbert, *Jahrb. f. Philol. Suppl. Bd. XXIII*, p. 493 (cf. *Staatsalt*⁸, I, 136, n. 1) are against Philippi and believe with Busolt, *Staatsalt*⁹, p. 273, that Draco founded the ephetae. If we don't accept the latter view we must leave the matter in doubt. See Miller, l. c. pp. 2824-6, art. *ephetai*; Lipsius, *Jahresber. XV*, 284 sq.; Hermann-Thumser, *Griech. Staatsalt.* I, 2, 355 sq.; cf. Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*¹⁰ II, 234 sq. and Gilbert, *Staatsalt*¹¹ I, 424 sq.

⁵ *Philologus, Suppl. Bd. III* (1878), p. 345 sq.

⁶ VIII, 111.

⁷ Aristotle, *Constit.* 3. 5; Bekker, *op. cit.*, 449, 19-21; Suidas, s. v. *δρυών*; etc.

much as we know from both Aristotle and Pollux that these same phylobasileis sat in judgment at the Prytaneum, it follows that the Basileum and Prytaneum formed one and the same court, for it would be inconceivable that two courts, presided over by the same judges, were in the same peribolus. Bötticher believes that before the synoecism of Theseus the tribe-Kings met the King at his basileum, which he thinks may have been originally only an open-air cathedra. When Theseus constructed the prytaneum in the narrower sense of the word, by adding to the basileum a hearth, banquet hall (*εστιατήριον*) and their appendages, which, perhaps, had the form of a stoa and exedra, the court still sat in the basileum, though it was known thereafter as the court *ἐπὶ τῷ πρυτανεῖῳ*, a name which it kept to the latest days. Until the prytaneum in the narrow sense of the word was added to the basileum, he believes the old hearth remained above on the Acropolis; with the transference of the Acropolis palace to the lower city, the hearth came too. Thus Theseus joined the Prytaneum with its eternal hearth to the old official seat of the tribe-Kings, which still retained the ancient court.

Whatever truth there may be in this theory, we must, quite apart from it or any similar line of argument, look for the beginnings of this curious court in prehistoric times. Whatever the date of the founding of the other murder courts at Athens, whether, as many assume, they go back only to the legislation of Draco, or are earlier, we can be certain that the ceremonial trials held at the Prytaneum must have existed from remote times, for the ideas underlying them are based on the primitive view that both things and animals are responsible for their acts. For such animistic conceptions of nature belong to the infancy of races as of individuals. Nor is it strange that a people who saw something divine in every tree, fountain and river, should have endowed common things with life and animals with responsible intelligence. The strange thing is, not that such notions should have developed in primitive Greece, but that they should have clung to the Greek imagination throughout the history of the race, and that they should have been countenanced by their greatest thinker. It is only, perhaps, when we fully understand the conservative spirit of the state religion and ritual that we can see how this was possible.

We know, that though such beliefs are characteristic of primitive peoples, they leave their traces among the most civilized. The numerous prosecutions of animals before state and ecclesiastical courts in Europe—there are cases dating from the ninth century into the twentieth—show to what an extent the idea of the moral responsibility of animals may develop.¹ And the laws of deodand in England—whereby personal chattels, such as carts and wheels which had caused the death of a man, were “forfeited to God, that is to the King, God's Lieutenant on earth, to be distributed in works of charity for the appeasing of God's wrath”²—which were not repealed until the reign of Victoria,³ show how far animistic notions may survive among a highly cultured people.

The object of Plato's ideal legislation, which we have discussed, was exactly the same as that which was at the bottom of all the laws against murder at Athens—the appeasing of the Eriny or avenging spirit of the dead man.⁴ If this were not done and every attempt made to bring the murderer to justice, calamity was sure to befall the community. Antiphon says of a certain murderer: “It is harmful for you that this man, vile and polluted as he is, should enter the precincts of the gods to defile them, or should poison with his infection the guiltless person whom he meets at the same table. From such causes spring plagues of barrenness and reverses in men's fortunes”⁵. In a final analysis, it resolves itself into nothing less than the *lex talionis*, the oldest and deepest-rooted in human nature of

¹ See E. P. Evans, *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals*, London 1906, and other works cited by him. The first case he adduces is the prosecution of moles in the valley of Aosta in 824; the last was the condemning to death of a dog which had helped its master kill and rob a man in the village of Délémont, Switzerland, 1906. In all he has brought together over 200 such prosecutions.

² Coke, *Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England* (1680), p. 57; cf. *Blackstone, Commentary on the Laws of England*, Bk. I, ch. 8.

³ In 1846: see *Stephen, Hist. of the Criminal Law of England*, III, 78; *Pollock and Maitland, History of English Law before the time of Edward I*, II, 473.

⁴ The medieval church taught in effect the same doctrine, substituting the daemons of the Christian theology for the Furies of Mythology.

⁵ *First Trilogy*, A, 10; in the Second, Γ, 8, he speaks of *θελα κηλίς* or “divine stain”; cf. *Aeschyl. Eumen.* 815, where the Erinyes threaten Attica with *λειχήν δαφνίλλος, δατεκνός*—“leafless blight and childlessness”; cf. *Soph. Oed. Tyr.* 25 and 101.

all laws, axiomatic in primitive societies and lingering on among those most advanced. Aeschylus vindicated the ways of God with men by insisting that the law of Righteousness was all-pervading. If a man suffers, it is merely a divine visitation of sin. If circumstances make it difficult to understand why this man or that suffers, or why he suffers more than his offence would seem to merit—search his family history and you will surely find that a commensurate sin has been committed somewhere. So the belief in destiny helped the doctrine of retribution.¹ Nowhere is the Greek law of “blood for blood”—whether the slaying was wilful or accidental made no difference, for in either case the moral equilibrium had been disturbed—more strongly affirmed than in the *Choephoroi*, where Orestes says:

“Just meed may the unjust obtain!
Earth and ye powers of Hades, hear my prayer.”

To which the chorus replies :

“For law it is, when on the plain
Blood hath been shed, new blood must fall,
Carnage doth to the Fury call;
Avenger of the earlier stain,
She comes, new Ruin leading in her train.”²

Inwoven with this idea of retribution was the whole Greek conception of personifying inanimate objects. A most striking example is found in the first stasimon of the *Electra* of Sophocles, where the Chorus, encouraged by the tidings of Clytaemestra's dream predicting early retribution on Agamemnon's murderers, says: “Not forgetful is the two-edged axe of bronze that struck the blow of old and slew him with foul cruelty”.³ Here the very axe is imagined as harboring a

¹ Cf. Jebb, *Classical Greek Poetry*, pp. 181-2. He shows that Sophocles also, with his milder doctrine of fate, believed in the same notion, though he treated it as a less prominent agency: he saw it working in the houses of Pelops and Labdacus: a comparison, however, of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Septem* shows the difference in the application of the idea by the two writers.

² 398-404 (Swanwick).

³ 484-6 (Jebb): cf. also l. 99, where Electra speaks of the φόνιος πέλεκυς—“the murderous axe”; and cf. *Trachiniae*, 856-9, where the “dark steel of the spear” “bore off” Iole from “high Oechalia's peaks”.

grudge against those who had wrongly used it and brought pollution on it. Nor are such instances, which can be multiplied from Greek literature, merely the result of poetic coloring, but they were based on a real belief inherent in the race. Aristotle, speaking of "chance circumstances", instances the statue of Mitys at Argos, which fell upon his murderer and killed him.¹ Similarly Theocritus tells how a statue of Eros, which stood on a pedestal overlooking a bathing-place, leaped upon and killed a youth bathing beneath it because he had driven his lover to suicide by his refusal.² In these cases there was no prosecution as in that of the statue of Theagenes, but the same ideas of revenge underlay them.

The operation of the law of reprisal seems still clearer in the case of animals. Various opinions have been advanced since Thomas Aquinas published his *Summa theologica* down to our time to explain the prosecutions of animals inaugurated by the medieval church.³ I have discussed many of these theories elsewhere,⁴ and here need only touch upon one which has been applied also to the prosecutions of animals at Athens. Ayrault,⁵ at the end of the sixteenth century, explained such punishment in the Middle Ages as a symbolic act intended to inspire a horror of crime in the minds of men. In the last century this theory has gained much adherence. Thus Leon Ménabréa⁶ believed the church was eager to revive in the people a sentiment for justice, since through sad experience they had come to

¹ *Poetics*, 9. 12, p. 1452 a, 7 sq.

² *Idylls*, XXIII, 59-60: cf. Callimachus, *Epigr.* VIII (Sch.), who recounts a similar death.

³ Aquinas (1225-74) explained them on the basis that animals were the embodiments of evil spirits, so that it was not they that were aimed at but Satan through them. His theory was helped by the fact that the Old Testament frequently mentions animals—e. g. adders, dragons, Leviathans, scorpions, etc.—as such incarnations. It is the basis of the view of Karl von Amira, *Thierstrafen und Thierprocesse* (1891), p. 160.

⁴ The Prosecution and Punishment of Animals and Things in the Middle Ages and Modern Times, Univ. Penn. Law Review, vol. 64, no. 7 (May, 1916), pp. 696-730, especially p. 716 sq.

⁵ *Des procès faicts au cadaver, aux cendres, à la mémoire aux bestes brutes* (Angers, 1591), fol. 24; cf. Tissot, *Le droit pénal*, I, 19 sq.

⁶ *De l'origine de la forme et de l'esprit des jugements rendus au moyen âge contre les animaux* (Chambéry, 1846); cf. the similar view of Du Boys (author of the *Histoire du droit criminel des peuples modernes*, Paris, 1854-60), quoted by d'Addosio, *Bestie delinquenti* (1892), p. 139.

know right only as synonymous with might. More recently, Thonissen¹ has given this as an explanation of the Athenian trials. But any such "moral" theory is far from satisfactory. The true solution of the medieval trials seems far simpler. Though the maledictions and excommunications of the church may have been a magic means of getting rid of scourges of insects rather than punishments, it seems probable that the condemnation of animals was at bottom merely the result of feelings of revenge.² The animal had to suffer because its act had aroused indignation and because it was looked upon as responsible.³ This feeling of revenge can be traced back to an old European custom. Thus, as Westermarck observes, among practically all the Aryan nations of ancient Europe—among the Greeks,⁴ Romans,⁵ Teutons,⁶ Celts⁷ and Slavs⁸—an animal which had done serious injury, such as biting or killing a

¹ *Le droit pénal de la république Athénienne* (1875), p. 414; he says, "on frappait l'animal auteur d'un homicide, afin que le pueple, en voyant périr un être privé de raison, conçut une grande horreur pour l'effusion du sang humain".

² Brunner, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des deutschen und französischen Rechtes* (1894), p. 517 sq.; cf. Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, I (1906), pp. 256 sq.

³ Post, *Die Grundlagen des Rechtes* (1884), p. 359; K. Friedrichs, *Mensch und Person* (in *Das Ausland*), LXIV (1891), p. 300, 315.

⁴ Xenoph. *Hell.* II, 4. 41; Plut. *Solon* 24. A similar ordinance about muzzling dogs is found also in the Avesta (Vendidad, Fargard XIII, 29-30) where, if a mad dog appears without barking, the people are enjoined to "place round its neck a wooden collar to which is attached on both sides a muzzle, of an ashti (i. e. the thickness of a brick) if the wood is hard, or two if it is soft". But here nothing is said about giving up the animal. In Solon's law, the animal can be returned to its owner, if compensation for the injury is made.

⁵ *Institutiones* (of Justinian), ed. P. Krüger, in *Corpus juris civilis*, I, IV, 9; *Digesta*, ed. T. Mommsen, *ibid.* I, IX, 1.

⁶ *Lex Salica* (The Ten Texts, etc. ed. by J. Hessels, 1880), Cod. I, 36; *Lex Ripuariorum*, 46 (in *Georgisch, Corpus juris Germanici antiqui, Halae*, 1738); cf. J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* (ed. A. Heusler and R. Hübner, Leipsic, 1899), pp. 664 sq.; Brunner, *op. cit.* p. 513.

⁷ *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland* (1865-79), I, 161; IV, 177, 179, 181; *Welsh Laws*, IV, 1, 17 (in *Ancient Laws and Institutions of Wales*, 1841, p. 391).

⁸ W. A. Macieowski, *Slavische Rechtsgesch.*, Stuttgart, 1835-9, IV, p. 333.

man, had to be given up to the injured party or his family. Here there was no trial; but it is inconceivable that the animal was given up as compensation. It is certain that it was done for retaliation, that the victim or his family might be revenged.¹ Later on in the Middle Ages the form of reprisal was changed into a regular system of punishment, which implies that the principle according to which punishment succeeded revenge in the case of human crimes had been extended by analogy to comprehend injuries done by animals. The beast was retaliated upon for the simple reason that it was regarded as a rational being. This feeling was not only at the bottom of the trials of animals at the Prytaneum and in the courts of the Middle Ages, but it has been common to all ages and to all grades of human society. The savage, in wreaking his vengeance, makes no distinction between men and beasts. In the Koran we read that animals will share in the resurrection and be judged according to their works.² In Zoroaster's legislation a dog is said to have the characters of eight different sorts of people.³ We know that animals were admitted as witnesses in medieval courts,⁴ that their youth was there a ground of acquittal,⁵ and that a

¹ For works cited see Westermarck, I, 256, n. 1.

² VI. 38; cf. Sell, *Faith of Islam*, p. 223; for these examples see Westermarck, I, 258-60.

³ *Vendidad*, XIII, 44-48; Darmesteter thus translates verse 44: "Le chien à lui seul a huit caractères . . . d'un prêtre, guerrier, laboureur, musicien, etc." However my colleague, Dr. Carnoy of Louvain, says this is ambiguous, as it implies that the dog is the receptacle of eight different natures. The Avestan word *asta-bifra* literally means "is the equivalent of", and the sentence is translated more exactly by Wolf in his rendering of the Avesta (Strassburg, 1910, based on C. Bartholomae): "Der eine Hund lässt sich mit achtten vergleichen". Dr. Carnoy adds that in the following lines the word used is *haya*, which is of obscure origin but apparently akin to the modern Persian word *xim*, "character", in meaning; it is translated by Wolf as "Gebaren": "es zeigt ein Gebaren wie ein Priester, etc." Thus in substance the meaning is that the dog is comparable to eight beings in some aspect of his nature —a tribute to his value.

⁴ Cf. Michelet, *Origines du droit français*, pp. 76, 279 sq.; Chambers, *Book of Days*, I, p. 129.

⁵ Thus a sow and her six pigs were tried for murdering a child at Savigny-sur-Etang (Bourgogne) in 1456; the pigs were acquitted partly because of their youth: *Mémoires de la Société Royale des Antiquités de France*, VIII (1827), pp. 441-5; Chambers, I, p. 128-9.

repetition of the crime aggravated the penalty.¹ And it is not only ordinary minds which have ascribed intelligent responsibility to brutes. Porphyry² says all philosophers, who have studied the natures of animals, agree that they are possessed of reason to a certain extent. Christian writers have gone further. Thus in the sixteenth century, Benoit³ argued that animals could talk—an idea as old as Homer, and in the next century a book was written in Latin to prove that they could reason better than men.⁴ At about the same time Crell⁵ maintained that they had faculties analogous to reason and free will, as well as vices and virtues, and so deserved rewards and punishments. His ideas, to some extent, have found an echo in the scientific works of the modern school of anthropologists.⁶

Thus we see that the trials of animals at Athens were only one manifestation of a very general principle.

In the earlier part of this discussion I have shown that in all probability the origin of the strange ritual of the buphonia is to be sought in some form of totemism or in some allied primitive fact. In the latter part I have found the origin of the Prytaneum trials of inanimate things and of animals embedded in the hoary *lex talionis*, coupled with the usual Greek notion of personification, which is merely a relic of prehistoric animism. Thus there appear to be two different sets of ideas quite independent of one another at the bottom of the buphonia and the trials, so that I conclude that there is little inherent probability in the tradition handed down by Pausanias that the trials of things at Athens originated in the ceremonial process of the axe used by the first ox-slayer at the celebration of the festival of the Diipolia.

In conclusion let us briefly consider whether there are traces of ideas elsewhere in the ancient world similar to those under-

¹ Pertile, *Gli Animali in giudizio* (Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di scienze, etc. Ser. VI, Vol. IV, 1884-5), p. 148.

² *Op. cit.* III, 6.

³ Quoted by d'Addosio, p. 214.

⁴ By Rorarius; *Quod animalia bruta ratione utantur melius homine*, Paris, 1648.

⁵ In his *Ethica Christiana* (1663?) : cf. Westermarck, I, p. 259.

⁶ e. g. Lombroso, *Il Delitto negli animali* (Archivio di Psichiatria, II, 1881).

lying the Prytaneum trials. In general it may be said that such criminal prosecutions are found only among the ancient Teutonic peoples. But there are many analogies of the Greek notion of regarding things and animals as intelligent and responsible agents.

Thus in India the gods of the Vedic age cursed the trees which had injured them.¹ In Persia Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus the Great, is said to have accidentally inflicted with his sword a mortal wound on his thigh, the very spot where he had sacrilegiously given the death blow to the sacred bull Apis.² To the Greek Pausanias this was the best example of an inanimate object inflicting of its own accord a righteous punishment.³ The childish rage of Xerxes in scourging and fettering the Hellespont,⁴ and the vengeance wreaked by Cyrus on the river Gyndes by dissipating it into 360 channels,⁵ are well-known illustrations of the same principle.

The exact antithesis of the Greek custom of trying guilty things is seen in the Roman law ascribed to Numa,⁶ and mentioned by Cicero and other Latin writers,⁷ according to which "if a weapon have sped from the hand rather than been aimed",⁸ the weapon is not tried, but the owner must tender a ram as a peace offering to the victim's kinsmen. Dio Cassius⁹ tells a story about a statue of Apollo, which is very similar to the stories already mentioned about statues in Greece. It wept for three days after the death of Scipio Africanus and was then cut to pieces and cast into the sea by the Romans at the advice of their soothsayers.

The condemnation and banishment of inanimate objects which had caused the death of a man is seen in the spirit of

¹ Oldenburg, *Die Religion des Veda*, p. 518.

² Herod. III, 64. The point of the story is no less real if we read in Ctesias that the King died of a wound self-inflicted on his femoral muscle while whittling a piece of wood with a small knife.

³ I. 28. II.

⁴ Herod. VII. 35.

⁵ Herod. I, 189: cf. 202 and V. 52.

⁶ So Servius in Verg. Ecl. IV. 43. It was later incorporated into the Twelve Tables as part of Tab. VIII: see R. Schöll, *Legis Duodecim Tabularum Reliquiae* (1866), p. 150, 24.

⁷ Topica, 17. 64; cf. Pro Tullio, 21. 51 and De Orat. III, 39, 158; also Boethius, *Comm. in Cic. Top. I*: Augustine, *de liber. arbitr. I. 4. 9.*

⁸ "Si telum manu fugit magisquam iecit."

⁹ fr. 83 M.: cf. Pausanias, IV, p. 39.

the ancient Germanic codes. These do not content themselves with imposing general obligations to appease the relatives of the dead man, but determine very definitely the amount which must in each case be paid to the surviving kinsmen.¹ In the Ripuarian laws men were forbidden to use what had been the "auctor interfectionis".² In Anglo-Saxon laws, a sword with which a man had been slain was "nicht gesund", and consequently could not be used until the crime had been expiated. No cutler would sharpen or repair it until he had a certificate that it was free of taint.³ An old municipal law of Schleswig made a builder responsible if anyone were slain by a beam falling from his building, and he had to pay a fine of nine marks or give over the timber to the victim's kinsmen; if he persisted in building it into the house, the later owner might have to atone for the homicide with the whole building.⁴ According to a law of King Alfred in the ninth century, when men worked together in a forest, and one accidentally let a tree fall and kill a companion, the tree went to the victim's family if removed in thirty days.⁵ The later English laws of *deodand* already mentioned were Germanic in origin, despite Blackstone's notion that they were the evil invention of Popery. Here regular trials took place before juries composed of twelve men, who investigated the occurrence and evaluated the guilty object, which was then forfeited or accursed.⁶ But these latter examples bring us down into the Middle Ages.

There are, on the other hand, comparatively few examples of animals being treated as responsible agents among other nations of antiquity. There is a remarkable injunction in the religious laws of the Persians,⁷ according to which, if a mad dog is not muzzled and, without barking, wounds a man or a sheep, he is

¹ See C. Trummer, *Die Lehre von der Zurechnung* (1845), chs. 28-38; *Vorträge über Tortur, etc., in der Hamburgischen Rechtsgeschichte* (1844-9), I, 376 sq.; Brunner, *Forschungen*, p. 521 sq.; R. Schmid, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (1858).

² *Lex Ripuariorum* LXXI.

³ Cf. Evans, p. 187.

⁴ Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgesch.* II, 557, n. 31.

⁵ *Laws of Alfred* (*Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, 1840, II, 13).

⁶ Blackstone, par. 301, n. e.

⁷ *Vendidad, Fargard XIII*, v. 31: cf. 32 sq.; *Yashts, XXIV*, 44.

to be punished with the penalty of baodho-varshta, i. e. as for wilful murder.¹ This punishment takes the form of a progressive mutilation, corresponding with the number of persons or beasts bitten, beginning with the loss of the ears and ending with the amputation of the tail.² Thus insanity could not be pleaded in the animal's defence.³ So cruel a law seems utterly out of harmony with the kindly spirit which pervades the Avesta in general towards animals, which are recognized as creatures of Ahura Mazda, and it is also inconsistent with the measures taken by the Aryan peoples generally for the protection of the dog, an animal so useful to pastoral peoples. In fact, in a succeeding paragraph of the Vendidad, the Mazdayasnians are commanded to treat a mad dog humanely, "to wait upon him with medicaments and to try to heal him, just as they would care for a righteous man".⁴ Such a contradictory enactment may be explained as a later interpolation, dating possibly from the Sassanian period of Persian history, to which we owe our present form of the Avesta.

The Jewish enactments about killing animals are well known. Thus an ox which gored a man or woman to death was to be stoned and its flesh could not be eaten. The owner was quit, unless it was shown that the beast had been wont to gore and had not been guarded, when both ox and owner were put to death. If a ransom was laid on the ox, it had to be paid, the amount exacted for goring a servant being stated as thirty shekels of silver.⁵ Here, as in the Avestan writings, there are no certain indications of court proceedings. But the fact that in both accounts the penalty was increased with the number of injuries seems to show that adjudication must have been

¹ J. Darmesteter, *Le Zend Avesta*, II, p. 196, explains this as "le méfait volontaire et la peine qui suit"; cf. index, "méfait volontaire, en général l'homicide".

² vv. 32-4.

³ In the Middle Ages also a mad dog could not plead insanity in the courts. Thus in 1610 several mad dogs, which had torn a Franciscan novice, were tried and executed. The remarkable feature of this case is that they were tried by a legal tribunal, no account being taken of their rabies as an extenuating principle; see Evans, p. 176 (quoted from Mornacius).

⁴ XIII, 35.

⁵ Exodus, XXI, 28-32.

in the hands of judges. There are examples of anathemas against both animals and things in the Old Testament writings: thus Jahveh's cursing of the serpent in Eden¹ and David's malediction against the mountains of Gilboa that they receive neither dew nor rain² may be mentioned. Nor should we omit the cursing of the barren fig tree of Bethany by Jesus in the New Testament.³

There is no indication in Roman law that animals were held responsible for their acts. The phrase "animal quod sensu caret" occurs in the codes.⁴ Though the tradition that the commission drawn up to codify the laws of Rome—the later Lex XII Tabularum—went to Athens to consult Solon's code seems well founded,⁵ no imitation of the Prytaneum process can be traced, so far as the fragments of the law are known.⁶ But outside the realm of their legal system, we see in their ritual a curious survival of the doctrine of retribution according to which the descendants of animals which have committed crimes are punished. On the anniversary of the preservation of the Capitol from the night attack of the Gauls, the descendants of the geese, which gave the warning by their cackling, were honored, while those of the unvigilant dogs were treated with contumely. Thus Plutarch says that, still in his day, a dog fastened to a cross, and a goose lying upon rich cushions on a bed of state, were carried with pompous solemnity about the streets of Rome. Pliny adds that each year punishment was inflicted upon the dogs by crucifying several on a gibbet of elder between the temples of Juventas and Summanus and that the first duty of the censor was to farm out the feeding of the sacred geese.⁷ Such an imputation of merit and demerit was

¹ Genesis, III, 14-15.

² II Samuel, I, 21.

³ Matthew, XXI, 19.

⁴ e. g. *Digesta* (of Justinian), IX, 1; *Institut.* IV, 9.

⁵ See Bösch, *De XII tabularum lege a Graecis petita* (1893).

⁶ See the last recension by M. Voigt: *Gesch. und System des Civil- und Criminal-Rechtes, wie Processe der XII Tafeln nebst deren Fragmenten* (Leipsic, 1883), I, p. 697 sq.: cf. Schöll, *op. cit.*, and F. Goodwin, *The XII Tables* (1886).

⁷ Plut. *De Fortuna Rom.* 12 and *Quaest. Rom.* 98; Pliny, *H. N.* 29, 14 and 10, 26. For the Gallic attack, see *Livy*, V. 47; *Cicero*, *Pro Roscio* 20; *Servius ad Aen.* 8, 652; *Dionys. Halic.* XIII, 7.

about as sensible as the Jewish idea of visiting the sins of the fathers on the children, or any such scheme of inherited guilt, or vicarious atonement. For they all—as Evans remarks¹—are applications of the primitive principle, according to which the whole tribe is held responsible for the conduct of each one of its members. It was still in vogue in the Middle Ages, when pigs were the commonest animals brought before the bar of justice, as they were supposed, on account of their Gadarene ancestors, to be the most liable to diabolical possession. A more modern example is afforded by the custom of cock fighting, which formed a general amusement in England and Scotland up to the nineteenth century. On Shrove Tuesday boys were allowed to bring their favorite cocks to the village school, where the bout was to be “pulled off” before the master as umpire.² Those who felt that the practice needed any defence, found it in the idea that the race of cocks was to suffer this annual barbarity by way of punishment for the crime of St. Peter, though, it must be added, few had any such scruples.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

¹ p. 177.

² Roberts, *Social History of the People of the Southern Counties of England* (1856), p. 421; Rogers, *Social Life in Scotland* (1884-86), II, 340.

IV.—GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM.¹

I. Part of a marble stele, the purpose of which is obscure. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Width 0.324 m.; height 0.179...0.223 m.; thickness 0.05 m. The stone has been deliberately cut from the original stele so as to form a rectangle suitable for use in a structure of masonry. This rectangle is now divided into two almost equal fragments by a perpendicular fracture. The lower edge shows a number of deep incisions made by a chisel. Both side edges are intact. One face is entirely covered with an elegantly cut inscription of nine lines, each of which consists of the name of a Greek together with his nationality. Letters shallowly incised, 0.037 m. in height, of the best Ptolemaic period. The ends of the strokes in the majority of the letters are slightly clubbed.

ΕΠΙΜΑΧΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ
ΤΑΥΡΩΝ ΑΚΑΡΝΑΝ
ΛΥΣΩΝ ΡΟΔΙΟΣ
ΚΛΕΙΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΡΟΔΙΟΣ
ΑΓΙΑΣ ΡΟΔΙΟΣ
ΦΙΛΩΝΙΧΟΣ ΒΟΞΠΟΡΙΤΗΣ
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΡΟΔΙΟΣ
ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ ΜΥΤΙΛΗΝΑΙΟΣ
ΜΟ[λ]ΠΑΓΟ[ρ]ΑΞ Β[οσπ]ΩΡΙΤΗΣ

'Επίμαχος 'Αθηναῖος, | Ταύρων 'Ακαρνάν, | Λύσων 'Ρόδιος, | Κλειτόμαχος 'Ρόδιος, | 'Αγίας 'Ρόδιος, | Φιλώνιχος Βοσπορίτης, | Διονυσόδωρος 'Ρόδιος, | 'Απολλώνιος Μυτιληναῖος, | Μο[λ]παγό[ρ]αξ Β[οσπ]ωρίτης.

Not one of these nine names is recorded elsewhere in Egypt linked with any ethnic qualification whatsoever, and only 'Επίμα-

¹Mr. C. T. Currelly, the Director, has generously given me access to these inscriptions.

χος, Δύσων, Ἀπολλάνιος and Διονυσόδωρος are noted in the Ptolemaic period. These four names, we infer, belonged, in these specific instances, to men who were Egyptian citizens by birth or by naturalization or who through length of residence were considered as good as naturalized. These we can therefore neglect as a group in this investigation. Of the entire list only Ἀπολλάνιος and Διονυσόδωρος are at all common. It is obvious, then, that our efforts to identify these men must be limited almost entirely to a study of already known personages outside of Egypt bearing the same names, claiming the same nationalities, and belonging to the same general period. But in order to know the period we must first of all determine the date of this inscription as closely as the evidence will permit.

In this task epigraphy is, unhappily, our sole support. The fact that certain strokes, as we have already observed, are slightly clubbed at the ends is strong testimony that the inscription is not pre-Ptolemaic. CIG, III, 4702 is an inscription (now at the bottom of the sea, unfortunately) of Egyptian origin which contains a list of Greek names and nationalities very similar to those in our inscription. Its editor, following the report of Minutoli, the discoverer of the stone, states that the letters are of the best period (presumably Attic, in this case). For this reason alone he is inclined to believe that the men named in the inscription were soldiers serving under Chabrias, the Athenian, in his Egyptian expedition of c. 360 B. C. As the discoverer's description contains no hint that the letters manifest any tendency toward the clubbing of strokes we conclude that our inscription is of more recent date. Owing to the loss of the presumably older stone this conclusion must remain unverified.

Let us now consult the epigraphical evidence of definitely dated texts. In the Sitzb. d. K. Pr. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1902, p. 1093, No. 2, Wilamowitz discusses an inscription in the museum at Alexandria which on indisputable grounds he dates in the period 276-270, i. e., early in the reign of Philadelphus. A photograph of a squeeze of this published by Wilhelm (Beitr. z. gr. Inschriftenkunde, p. 324, fig. 89) shows precisely the same type of letters as those in the Toronto inscription. On the basis of similar epigraphical

resemblance Wilamowitz (op. cit., p. 1096) locates a Rhodian inscription in approximately the same period (cf. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Hermes*, XXXVIII, p. 320). The reality of this resemblance we can confirm by means of a photographic reproduction (Wilhelm, op. cit., p. 323, fig. 88). From plates appended to Breccia's catalogue (Cat. gén. des ant. ég. du Mus. d'Alexandrie, *Iscr. gr. e lat.*) we know that certain inscriptions (Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 292) dating between 304 and 246 exhibit almost the same epigraphical characteristics as those we are endeavoring to date. Of similar import is an inscription of the year 238 published in Milne's catalogue (Cat. gén. des ant. ég. du Mus. du Caire, Gr. and Lat. Inscr., 22186; for facsimile see Miller, *Jour. des Sav.*, 1883, pp. 214 ff.). The transcriptions in capitals of Nos. 9270 and 9284 (both dating 270-246) of this same work are of little service to us. Of all the inscriptions here noted those originating prior to 270 resemble our inscription epigraphically more than those of a later date. To this may be added the general observation that a large majority of the inscriptions listed by Breccia (op. cit.) which contain the names and ethnika of Greeks belong to the third century. If, then, we have not been deceived in the resemblances just pointed out, we cannot but conclude that our inscription was made in the third century B. C., and probably in the first decades of that century, or even in the closing years of the fourth.¹

The possible objection that this period is too early for Greek mercenaries to appear in Egypt may be answered by an appeal to certain documents. By Herodotus (II, 152-154; Breasted, *A Hist. of Eg.*, p. 569) we are told of the engagement of Carians and Ionians in the service of Psammetichus. Four papyri from Elephantine (Rubensohn, *Aeg. Urk. aus d. K. Mus. in Berlin*, *Elephantine-Pap.*, i-iv), ranging in date from 311 to 283, register the names and ethnika of a number of Greek soldiers. Further, there is the possibility that CIG, III, 4702, already mentioned, has to do not with a band of men in the service of Athens, but with Greek mercenaries in the service of Egypt. Rubensohn (op. cit., p. 19) notes the sig-

¹ For the establishment of the approximate date of other Egyptian inscriptions about contemporary with ours see Jouguet, *Bull. de Corr. Hell.*, XXI (1897), pp. 191-193.

nificant fact that the papyri in question, although originating in Egypt and at a relatively late date, are in language and composition Greek documents untouched by Egyptian influence. The conservative impulse that operated in this case may have operated also in the so-called Chabrias inscription, accounting for the old style of lettering and the old manner of stone-cutting.

In the course of the year 305-4 we find a certain Epimachus Atheniensis employed with Demetrius Poliorcetes as chief architect and engineer of the siege-works of Rhodes (Vitr., X, 16, 9; Niese, *Gesch. d. gr. Staaten*, I, p. 327, n. 2). Of this man's career after the siege nothing is known. Let us suppose, for the purpose of argument, that he and the Epimachus of our inscription are one and the same man. In order to secure a rational explanation of the sudden appearance of Epimachus, the engineer, in Egypt, we have only to assume that he, like hosts of other Greeks at that time, was attached to Demetrius by the temporary bond of a business contract rather than by the more enduring bond of loyalty. The long siege of Rhodes ended, he was at liberty to enter into a new contract and serve under the banner of another. Rhodes and Demetrius were now at peace (Niese, *op. cit.*, p. 332; Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. des Lagides*, I, p. 78; Diod., XX, 99). At the same time the island enjoyed such intimate relations with the first Ptolemy that she was in a position to act as mediator in bringing about a tacit understanding between Ptolemy and Demetrius. Under such conditions as these it would be very easy for Epimachus to be released by the latter so as to join the former's staff of engineers occupied with the construction of numerous temples and other public works in Egypt (Bouché-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 103 ff.).¹ The reduced following and resources of Demetrius and the notoriously well-filled treasury of the Egyptian king would afford a natural explanation for such a change of masters. But, on the other hand, granting that Epimachus made no new alliance for several years subsequent to the siege of Rhodes, the definite pact between Demetrius and Ptolemy during the period 296-4

¹ E. g., a certain Cleon, an architect, was chief commissioner of public works in the Fayûm (Mahaffy, *A Hist. of Eg. under the Ptol. Dyn.*, p. 91).

(Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., p. 87; Plut., Demetr., 32) would supply a historical occasion for the architect to pass from the service of the one prince to that of the other without alienating the former. Inasmuch as the possible advent of Epimachus in Egypt on either of the occasions suggested would fall very close to or within the chronological limits to which epigraphical considerations lead us to confine our inscription, we believe it possible that he and our *'Εριμάχος Ἀθηναῖος* are identical.

Taύρων is a name previously recorded only in Arrian's *Anabasis* (V, 14, 2; 16, 3), and in the two passages where it appears refers to a toxarch of unknown nationality in the army of Alexander. This man played a prominent part in the battle between Alexander and Porus on the banks of the Hydaspes in 327. As Ptolemy was present in the army at that time (Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., pp. 4-5), and as he treated of this battle in his *Memoirs* (Arrian, *Anab.*, V, 14, 5), he must have been personally acquainted with Tauron, who would, therefore, have more reason than the ordinary adventurer for enlisting in the service of Ptolemy when the latter ascended the throne of Egypt. If 367 be the date of the birth of Ptolemy (Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., p. 3), he would be exactly forty during the year of the engagement with Porus. The probability is that Tauron, as an able-bodied soldier serving in so arduous a campaign, would be of about the same age. On the supposition, then, that he was thirty at that time, in the period 304-294, in which we would locate the removal of Epimachus to Egypt, he would be passing through the decade of life between fifty-three and sixty-three. This is rather too advanced an age, we must admit, for a man to enter into new and strange conditions of military service; but it is not necessary for us to assume that a man of Tauron's experience in organization need limit his activities to the affairs of war. The numerous undertakings of a purely peaceful character then being carried on in Egypt, undertakings requiring large bodies of thoroughly disciplined and organized laborers, would afford a very attractive and suitable occupation for a retired military officer of sixty.

Λύσων, the name of a Rhodian magistrate, is read on certain Rhodian coins of undetermined date (Mionnet, *Descr. des méd. ant.*, suppl., VI, 594). Once only does the name appear

in Egyptian documents of the Ptolemaic era, and that in military accounts of the years 251-249 (Flinders Petrie Pap., 109, a, iv, 1). There we read *Δημοκλῆς Λύσωνος*. The date of this papyrus restricts us to the conclusion that *Δημοκλῆς* was granted his homestead on the occasion of the first settlement of cleruchs in the military colony of the Fayûm. This took place shortly after the first Syrian war which closed in 274 or 271 (cf. Meyer, *Heerwesen d. Ptolemäer*, p. 32; Bouché-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 175 ff.); that is, in 274-3 or 271-0. The second settlement did not occur till 244 (or shortly after), the date of the close of the third Syrian war. Seeing that cleruchs were not necessarily worn-out veterans at the time of their retirement to the land, but were in many cases men still in the prime of life (see Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28), it is possible to imagine that Democles might have been as young as thirty-five or forty when awarded his *κλῆρος*. Even if we allow a latitude of a few years in either direction, Lyson his father would be a contemporary, and perhaps a coeval, of Epimachus and Tauron, according to our previous calculations. Owing to our ignorance of the nativity of Lyson our efforts towards identification can proceed no farther.

IG, XII, 1, 155, gives us the text inscribed on a monument erected in honor of a certain *Διονυσόδωρος* called 'Αλεξανδρεύς. As this cannot possibly date earlier than the close of the third century, and is with greater assurance of certainty assigned to the second, this *Διονυσόδωρος* cannot be the man of that name mentioned in our inscription.

In concluding this part of the discussion we can state that all the available evidence is insufficient to establish beyond doubt the identity of any of the personages considered. But certain striking coincidences emerge from the midst of the uncertainty. The epigraphical characteristics of the inscription coincide with a period in the lives of Epimachus and Tauron, when they might naturally have been associated with Ptolemy Soter. The fact that this Tauron is the only one of the name hitherto attested is significant. Similarly significant is it that the only Lyson known to us in Egypt in Ptolemaic times must have been about contemporary with the Lyson of the Toronto inscription. It is hard to banish the suggestion that these coincidences are not accidental.

The ethnic *Βοσπορίτης* refers here to the Cimmerian and not to the Thracian Bosphorus, in spite of its reference to the latter district in a fragment of Sophocles (Nauck, *Trag. Gr. Frag.*, No. 462). The name *Βόσπορος* was applied by extension both to the city of Panticapaeum, situated on the straits, and to the federation of Greek cities within the Bosporite kingdom (Strabo, XI, 495; Pliny, *H. N.*, IV, 24; Anon., *Periplus Ponti*, p. 7; Steph. *Byz.*, s. *Βόσπορος*; Latyschev, *Inscr. ant. orae sept. Ponti Eux.*, I, *passim*; IV, 418; cf. ib. 419; Collitz, *Gr. Dialekt-Inschr.*, III, 2, p. 662, 5557, n.). *Βοσπορίτης* is therefore a synonym of *Παντικαπατης* (cf. Latyschev, *op. cit.*, II, 4; 358) or of *Παντικαπαιεύς* (Strabo, II, p. 74). In the field of epigraphy this form (also as *Βοσπορείτης*) is attested only twice, and that in inscriptions (IG, II, 3, 2849, 2852) which can be only indefinitely located in the period 403-31 B. C. It is also cited by Stephanus of Byzantium (s. v.) along with *Βοσποριάνος*, *Βοσπορηνός*, *Βοσπόριος* and *Βοσπορικός*. The forms most frequently found in the inscriptions are *Βοσποράνος* and *Βοσπορεάνος* (Latyschev, *op. cit.*, I, 115-17; IG, II, 3, 2850-51; III, 2, 2397-98; XII, 1, 11). Strabo often refers to the Cimmerian Bosphorus, designating its citizens more commonly as *Βοσπορηνοί* or *Βοσποριανοί*, and only rarely as *Βοσπόριοι*. Certainly the nature of the evidence does not permit one to say that one form (unless, perhaps, an exception be made of *Βοσπορεάνος*) is more correct than another; *Βοσπορίτης*, however, seems to be the most literary.

Occurrences of the rare name *Μολπαγόρας* have been hitherto confined, with one exception, to Ionian sources—Miletus; its colony, Olbia; and Panticapaeum, the near neighbor of Olbia. The Molpagoras mentioned by Herodotus (V, 30) was a member of an aristocratic family of Miletus which perpetuated the ending *-αγόρας* in the names of its adherents (see Macan, *Herodotus*, *ad loc.*). It is probable that this name-ending possessed the same aristocratic significance in the colony. Of the two inscriptions containing the name published by Latyschev (*op. cit.*, II, 14=CIG, II, 2105; IV, 36) the first is dated on epigraphical grounds at the end of the fourth century or at the beginning of the third; it therefore corresponds closely to the period of the inscription which we are now editing. The second belongs to the fourth century

and may possibly point to the man named in the first. If this man (or, it may be, these men) is not actually identical with Μολπαγόρας Βοσπορίτης of the Toronto inscription, it is more than probable, owing to the exclusive proprietorship exercised by this well-known Milesian family in regard to the name-ending *-αγόρας*, that he was closely related to him by blood.

The name Φιλάνχος is not previously known in the Cimmerian Bosphorus.

The purpose of this interesting inscription can be only conjectured. We are doubtless safe in saying that it was votive in its character and was erected in honor either of the reigning Ptolemy (Soter or Philadelphus) or of some god (cf. CIG, III, 4702). If it antedates the establishment of the military colony in the Fayûm (274-3 or 271-0), as the strange association of Tauron, Epimachus and Lyson leads one to think, the names are those of soldiers or engineers in active service in the royal army of Egypt or in the great works of peace instituted by the first two Lagidae. If, on the contrary, it postdates this settlement, then the names are those of soldiers retired to the *ἐπίταγμα*, or reserves, and settled on homesteads in the Arsinoite Nome, or Fayûm. If the first alternative is true, the inscription may have originated outside of the Fayûm; but if the second is true, the inscription comes from within the Fayûm.

W. SHERWOOD FOX.

WESTERN UNIVERSITY, LONDON, CANADA.

(*To be continued*)

V.—PETRARCH AND THE WINE OF MEROE.

Outside of the pages of Petrarch, Meroe, a hundred miles or so north of Khartum, has not been renowned for its vineyards. Petrarch, however, praises the wine of this region, directly or by implication, four times, in three of the instances naming it with Falernian.

In the *Africa* (6.848–853), referring to the Genoese Riviera di Levante, and its steep vineyards, he praises the wine of Monterosso and Corniglia as superior to either Falernian or the wine of Meroe¹:

Parte alia sinuosa patent convexa Siestri;
Hinc solis vineta oculo lustrata benigno,
Et Baccho dilecta nimis, Montemque Rubentem,
Et juga prospectant Cornelia palmita late
Inclita mellifluo, quibus haud collesque Falernos
Laudatamque licet Meroen cessisse pudebit.

Afterward, in his *Itinerarium Syriacum*, he refers to this passage, and, expressing his surprise that the ancient poets had not praised this shore for its fertility in wine and oil, perhaps because it had not yet been ascertained and made public, he continues:

Hinc est, ut, quum claris saepe carminibus Meroen Falernumque concelebrent, terrasque alias, hanc cunctis hac laude praestantem omnes ignotam praeterierant [-int], etc.

In Eclogue 12, he couples the wines of Vesuvius with those of Falernus, the Cinque Terre of the Genoese coast, and Meroe:

Quid palmitibus seu dempta Phalernis
Seu Ligurum decerpta jugis ardentia vina,
Quaeque ferax gemino transmisit colle Vesevus
Dolia praecipiit rapidum spumantia musto,
Quaeque dedit Meroe soli subjecta propinquo.

Elsewhere, in a passage of the *Africa* describing a feast given by Syphax—probably at Cirta, the modern Constantine—to

¹Cf. my monograph, *The Last Months of Chaucer's Earliest Patron* (*Trans. Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences* 21.69).

Laelius, the emissary of Scipio, Petrarch mentions only Meroe, no doubt because it, too, belonged to the Dark Continent (3. 368-73) :

Non una dapes, non pocula simplex
Cura fuit variare viris: pars aurea gestant
Vasa manu, pars crystallo splendentia puro;
Ast alii effosso gemma crateres in ampla
Implebant spumante mero, quod miserat olim
Ipsa parens Meroe Phœbo succensa propinquo.

These allusions have puzzled the commentators. Domenico Rossetti, in a note on the eclogue (*Poemata Minora* 1. 299), would prefer to read 'Mare(i)a', assuming that the reference is to the Mareotic wine mentioned by Horace (O. 1. 37. 14) and Virgil (G. 2. 81); and this view is adopted by Corradini (Padova a Francesco Petrarca, p. 451), in his comment on *Africa* 6. 853. The hypothesis seems somewhat forced, however, and I believe it would be better to retain 'Meroe', and to assume that Petrarch in every case had in mind Lucan 10. 160-163:

Gemmaeque¹ capaces
Excepere merum, sed non Mareotidos uvae,
Nobile sed paucis senium² cui contulit annis
Indomitum³ Meroe cogens spumare⁴ Falernum.

Riley, the Bohn translator, explains: 'The Falernian wine, produced on the Massic hills of Italy, was naturally harsh, and was not considered fit for drinking unless it was ten years old; from the present passage it seems to have been thought to be improved by being sent to Meroe, near the borders of Aethiopia, in order to be mellowed by the heat, probably in much the same way that, at the present day, Madeira wine is sent for a voyage to the East or West Indies'.

Petrarch appears to have misunderstood Lucan, and to have thought of Meroe as an independent source of wine. That he had Lucan in mind is also suggested by the lay of the minstrel, following the description of Syphax's banquet (*Africa* 3. 382-

¹ See *Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed., 11. 567; Furtwängler, *Die Antiken Gemmen* 3. 155-6; *Pauly-Wissowa* 7. 1091-2.

² Ripeness, maturity (Haskins).

³ Difficult to mellow (Haskins).

⁴ To ferment, and so to ripen (Haskins); cf. Virgil, G. 2. 6.

451), as in Lucan the discourse of Achoreus (10. 194-331) follows the description of Cleopatra's feast.¹ That Petrarch was familiar with Lucan is abundantly shown by Nolhac (*Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, 2d ed., Index), though he is unwilling to admit (1. 195) that there is any imitation of him in the *Africa*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

¹ Körting (*Petrarca's Leben und Werke*, p. 661) thinks rather of the song of Iopas in Virgil, *Aen.* 1. 742-6.

VI.—ARYAN *pitar-* AND DRAVIDIAN **pitar-*.

The Dravidian languages of southern India have forms of the word 'name' representing an early stem **pitar-*: Kanara *hesaru*, Tamil *pejar* and *pēr*, Telugu *pēru*, Tulu *pudar*. We may assume the development **pitar-> *picar-> *pecar-* in Kanara, Tamil and Telugu. The sound *i* palatalized the following *t*; changes of this kind are common in modern Tamil.¹ Afterward *i* became *e* by the action of vowel-harmony or partial assimilation to the next vowel. Likewise spoken Tamil sometimes has *e* for literary *i* before *a*: examples given by Vinson, in his *Manuel de la langue tamoule*, are *ele*<*ilai* (leaf), *nelā*<*nilā* (moon), *velukku*<*vilakku* (lamp). Kanara *hesaru* has normal *h*, as in *hō-* (go) = Tamil *pō-*, Telugu *pō-*, Tulu *pō-*; and *s* for *c* as in *sā-* (die) corresponding to Tamil and Telugu stems which may be transliterated *cā-* (now pronounced with *ç* or *cç* in Tamil and with *ts* in Telugu). In Kanara, medial *ç*<*cç*<*c* was an earlier development than the voicing of occlusives between vowels; elsewhere the voicing of *c* was generally earlier than the change of *c* to a fricative. A few words have the sound *ç* (<*c*) as a variant of *j* (<*ç*<*c*) in Tamil: Vinson mentions *iqai* = *ijai* (agree), *muçal* = *mujal* (hare), *paiçal* = *paijal* = *paidal* (boy). Such variations must have originated in different dialects, like our *vixen* beside *fox* and Spanish *alto*<*altum* beside *soto*<*saltum*. The *u* of Tulu *pudar* has parallels in *bōdu* = Tamil *vēndum* (is needed), *buđu* = Tamil *vidu* (leave), *būr-* = Tamil *vīr-* (fall). Similar developments are found in spoken Tamil, according to Vinson: *potti*<*petti* (box), *pulle*<*pillai* (child), *udu*<*vidu* (leave).

The northern Dravidian languages lack literature, aside from recent works composed mainly by Europeans. Brâhui

¹ Pope, *Tamil Handbook*, § 123 (Oxford, 1911). I use *j* with its Dutch value, for a sound like our *y* in *you*; *ç*=German *ch* in *echt*; *c*=Bohemian *t'*, Hungarian *ty*; *ç*=Bohemian *d'*, Hungarian *gy*; *x*=German *ch* in *acht*.

is carefully analyzed in Bray's Grammar (Calcutta, 1909). Short grammars and texts of the other northern languages, Gôndi, Kui, Kurukh and Malto, are given in the Linguistic Survey of India, vol. 4 (Calcutta, 1906). These languages have taken many common words from their Aryan neighbors. Thus Aryan numerals are used above 3 in Brâhui, above 7 in Gôndi and Kui, above 4 in Kurukh, above 2 in Malto. Aryan 'name' has also been freely borrowed: the Linguistic Survey records Gôndi *nāv* (p. 510) beside native *pidir* (p. 558). Kurukh *nāme* (p. 679), Malto *nami-* (p. 680). If we suppose that Dravidian **pitar-* was borrowed from Aryan, the meaning could have developed as follows: father>father's name>family-name>person's name. Tamil *pejar* means 'person' as well as 'name'. Brâhui regularly distinguishes the interrogative pronouns *dēr* (who) and *ant* (what), but there is a remarkable use of *dēr* that would be easier to understand if the word for 'name' formerly meant 'father'. From Bray's Grammar (§ 135) we learn that *dēr*, "though properly confined to persons", is also used in such phrases as *nā pin dēr e?* (what is your name?), *xōm-ta dēr e?* (what is his tribe?).

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Romanzo e realtà nella vita e nell' attività letteraria di Lucio Apuleio. ENRICO COCCHIA. Catania, F. Battiato, 1915. Pp. XV + 396.

One's first impression upon reading this book is that it was derived too directly from an extensive course of university lectures upon the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. There is the same leisurely way of dealing with the various questions involved; the same presentation of the substance of the narrative; the same relentless citation and discussion of all the authorities, important and unimportant, wise and foolish; the same disinclination on the part of the writer to betray the fact that he has formed any opinion of his own. But the impression is dispelled as we approach the conclusion of the matter. When we reach the last two chapters, we have abundant evidence that Professor Cocchia not only does have opinions of his own, but that they are clearly expressed and worthy of the most careful consideration. The great romance of Apuleius is far from being simply Lucius of Patras in a Latin costume with additional trimmings suitable to his first appearance in Roman society. The point is well made and even though I am not deeply impressed by some, at least, of the proofs which Cocchia adduces in support of his thesis, I am, nevertheless, quite ready to agree that as a critic and investigator of this wonderful book, he has taken a long step in the right direction. He believes with certain of the elder scholars that the book of Apuleius though founded, of course, upon the romance of Lucius is essentially different in one important particular. It is indeed a novel of adventure and may always be read and enjoyed as such. But it was not written primarily with that end in view. Cocchia's theory is derived from the relations existing, or supposed to exist, between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Apologia*, the most personal document which we have with regard to the life and character of the writer; indeed, apart from private letters, the *Apologia* is perhaps the most personal document which has come down to us from the literature of all antiquity. Having proved to his satisfaction that the *Metamorphoses* is a work of the author's maturity, but more especially that the date of it is subsequent to that of the *Apologia*, Cocchia develops at length the theory that the later work, though in appearance a mere novel of adventure, is in reality

an allegory of the author's own life, and of his mental and moral development as already depicted in the *Apologia*.

Personally I must confess that allegory, at all events allegory as extensive as we find it, for instance, in Spenser's *Faerie Queen* and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, not to mention the *Metamorphoses* as interpreted by Cocchia, does not appeal to me at all. To be frank I am distinctly bored by it. Allegory is a dangerous spirit to summon from the depths, and many a magician in the world of scholarship as well as in the world of literary art has received his mortal hurt thereby. Nor is the author the only one who is in danger. The weird and utterly impossible biographical tradition of Vergil which the old scholars derived from his *Eclogues* bears evidence to the fact that the pursuit of allegorical references in another man's work is a futile, not to say a dangerous, pastime. But allegory is largely a matter of period and in those strange days of the later Empire we may well suspect merely on general principles that Apuleius, just as Cocchia believes, was at one and the same time an allegorist and a novelist.

Here, however, I shall not pause to enumerate and discuss the arguments which Cocchia brings forward in support of his theory. I shall content myself merely with a hearty recommendation of the book to all who are interested in the great, the unique, literary masterpiece with which it is concerned.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Vespucci Reprints, Texts and Studies. The Cyrus H. McCormick Publication Fund of the Princeton University Library. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1916. No. 2. The Soderini letter, 1504; facsimile. \$75. No. 4. The Soderini letter, Critical translation with introduction by Professor G. T. Northup of Toronto University. \$1.25. No. 5. The *Mundus Novus* or *Medici* letter translated by Professor G. T. Northup. \$75. No. 6. The *Paesi novamente retrovati* 1598; facsimile. \$2.00. No. 7. The *Sensuyl le nouveau monde*, 1515; facsimile. \$2.00.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the generosity of Mr. McCormick in purchasing these excessively rare documents and to the authorities of Princeton University for making them available to the world at large. The problem of Amerigo

Vespucci seems to be one of the most difficult in history. And surely we can never hope to solve such a problem until the documents with which it is associated are made available to as many intelligent investigators as possible.

The most important and the most interesting of the series, at least to the lay reader, is the Soderini letter. Professor Northup is to be congratulated for his excellent work upon this mysterious document. Strange to say he seems to be the only one so far to realize fully that the first and most important problem to be solved is purely philological. It is not until we understand the weird dialect of this letter and the reasons for its existence that we can come to any sane or certain conclusion regarding the much disputed matter of text.

From the nature of the case it is impossible to restore the actual words of the text. But the editor believes that at least the statements of the original letter may be restored, and this is what he has attempted to do in his translation. 'It takes into account', as he says, 'all three versions and is based upon them all, rather than on any one of them'.

In his notes, the translator confines himself rigidly to matters of text. I could wish that he had been less rigidly exclusive of other matters. There are a number of statements in the letter which he of all men is best fitted to illustrate. For instance, on p. 14 Vespucci says, 'There we perceived that they were roasting a certain beast which resembled a serpent except that it had no wings', etc. 'Un serpente, salvo che non teneva alia'. It seems to me that *serpente* here needs to be explained by something beside the literal translation of 'serpent'. Apparently Vespucci was thinking of the armadillo, a beast for which in his experience there was no parallel except the dragon, that fabulous creature which long before the *Medea* of Euripides was as a matter of course furnished with wings.

Vespucci makes a curious impression on the reader, at all events on this reader; he suggests a man who has seen so much and has had so many new impressions that he is quite unable to give anything like an adequate account of them. No doubt part of it is due to his own inability to express himself clearly and picturesquely. He was a man of action, not a man of words. He must have been a good navigator but his knowledge of the Classics was to say the least extremely vague, otherwise he never would have referred to Catullus' famous dedication of his poems to Cornelius Nepos as, "I will say to you as Pliny said to Maecenas: 'Once upon a time you were wont to take pleasure in my prattlings'."

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

Prolegomena to an edition of the works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius, by Sister MARIE JOSÉ BYRNE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. Pp. vii + 101. \$1.25.

It would be easy to criticize this monograph, and the criticism would be entirely favorable, if the work had been called by any other name than *Prolegomena*. The real difficulty with the title of *Prolegomena*, especially at this stage of the author's studies, is illustrated and exemplified by my first attempt some years ago to use a certain academic library in a far country. I found that the shelf devoted to Dante contained only one book. That was a large and sumptuous Concordance to his complete works. During the next few days I had occasion several times to be impressed with the fact that, on the whole, Dante did not need the Concordance so much as the Concordance needed Dante. A somewhat similar relation exists between *Prolegomena* and the author with whom they are concerned.

The relation is such that in the present instance, for example, definite criticism is impossible unless we had the proposed edition before us. Let us hope that the editor intends to furnish that edition with a commentary. The work she has already done indicates that she would furnish a good one. And speaking in general there is nothing which a large share of the Greek and Latin classics need so much as a thorough and complete modern commentary. To my thinking it is just this kind of work which will do more than anything else to rouse a really living and profitable interest in those authors.

The most satisfactory and interesting portion of this article is that which is concerned with the poet's life, his friends, and his works. Professor Byrne has given a remarkably clear and vivid picture of Ausonius and of the times in which he lived. A strange age, the fourth century. The old was still surviving, though perhaps more in appearance than in reality. On the other hand, the new was still not altogether sure of itself, not altogether acceptable to every class in life.

Ausonius belonged intellectually and temperamentally to the old régime. It was a régime which had long since ceased to lead an active life in anything but phrases. But Ausonius was a man of phrases. He lived, moved and had his being in phrases. Happy for him that he lived in an age when there were at least a few men left who knew a good phrase when they heard it. Happy for him, too, that he died before the campaign of frightfulness under Alaric and the Teutons roused 'modern civilization', as no doubt it called itself, to the fact that it is neither so safe nor so powerful and persuasive as it fancies itself to be. The year 410 was not a good year for phrases. Still, after he

had recovered from the shock of it, Ausonius would no doubt have gone back to his phrases again and been quite as happy as before, so long as he remained unmolested. Few men have been so fortunate. He had a long and pleasant life, he was famous in his own time, he was famous for a long time afterwards, indeed, it is scarcely a century since he ceased to be generally read. He was one of those poets, who though certainly second rate possessed the rare gift of inspiring greater minds than his own. We cannot afford to ignore the man who suggested Herrick's 'Gather ye rose buds while ye may' and many another charming bit of verse by which the first three centuries of modern literature are remembered.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Syria as a Roman Province. By E. S. BOUCHIER. Pp. I-XI, 1-304. Plate of Coins. Map. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1916.

The reviser of Arnold's "Roman System of Provincial Administration" has again laid scholars under obligation by a specialized study of a Roman province. "Syria as a Roman Province" has the same general characteristics as the preceding volumes, "Life and Letters in Roman Africa" and "Spain under the Roman Empire". All three are informing, learned, and unassuming. We are fortunate to have them so well done in English.

The first chapter on the peoples and national characteristics of Syria and the second on the history and constitution of the province to the Antonine age, pass the subject in rapid review. The more detailed treatment of the succeeding chapters affords a better illustration of Mr. Bouchier's special fitness for this work, which has grown out of his apprenticeship on Arnold's book. The chapters on Antioch and Palmyra will interest the general reader. The Syrian dynasties at Rome (Chapter IV) find their proper setting in this volume, and Elagabalus appears here less a monster of iniquity than his biographers are accustomed to make him. Berytus, Damascus, Apamea, and other chief cities of Syria take on new interest and fall more into the scheme of things in the hands of Mr. Bouchier. The economic side is not neglected, but the chapters on the culture of the province, its literature, religion, architecture and the arts, occupying the last hundred pages of the book, are, perhaps

the most valuable part. Literature flourished from the Seleucid age to Procopius, a period of eight hundred years. Many names familiar in the history of Greek as well as Latin literature are met: Cicero's friend, the poet Archias, was born at Antioch; the historian Posidonius, a name to conjure with in Roman historiography, comes from Apamea; Nicolaus of Damascus is valuable to students interested in Julius and Augustus Caesar; the Jewish historian Josephus, born at Jerusalem, is the "principal authority for Syrian history under the early empire"; Lucian was a Syrian, as he proudly maintains, protesting almost too much; Ammianus Marcellinus was a native of Antioch. There is a Syrian influence in Latin literature, but this is not so important as the African or Spanish element, for not Latin but Greek was the language of literary men in the province of Syria. The religion of Syria, which is treated in chapter XI, was not always free from debauchery; even after the adoption of Christianity, it was superstitious and full of Oriental love of ritual and magic. The chapter on architecture and the arts could hardly have been written without the report of the Princeton expedition (1904). Greek influence is stronger than Roman in the arts, as in language and literature, but Syrian architects prefer Oriental ornamentation and in the "Arab parts of Syria Oriental features are more pronounced". Elaborate figures of birds and animals and favorite plants are frequent. "At Shakka is a rare example of the grotesque in Syrian sculpture, fat human figures and birds with abnormally long legs."

Septimus for Septimius is found on p. 108 l. 10. An occasional uncomfortable sentence, e. g. p. 265, last sentence in second paragraph, and p. 273, bottom, calls for revision, but to carp at such details is very ungrateful.

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

Lucrèce, *De la Nature*, livre quatrième, par ALFRED ERNOUT.
Paris, Klincksieck, 1916.

This edition of Book IV of the *De Rerum Natura*, with French version, introduction, and linguistic and interpretative comment, offers much that will be found of value to students—whatever their native idiom—of a particularly difficult portion of Lucretius. M. Ernout has apparently sought to present to readers interested in matters literary and philosophical a compact and usable Fourth Book,—with success, at least so far as touches the translation. Whether his notes are not, for this purpose, overloaded with linguistics is perhaps debatable.

A sane and straightforward but rather uninspired introduction gives, with a statement of the place of Book IV in the entire

work, a detailed summary of its contents, a brief estimate of the literary worth of the poem, an exhaustive account of Lucretius' handling of the hexameter as illustrated by Book IV (pages 7-17), and in closing, a conspectus of the history of the text. Of these, the metrical matter has independent value and will need to be considered by investigators of Lucretius' verse technique.

The carefully printed Latin text is based on Bailey's, with conservative variants. The full critical notes are cumbered with much needless information about unimportant readings. In the version, clearness, simplicity, and directness, essential qualities in a rendering of Lucretius to which the French lends itself admirably, are characteristic throughout, and naturally attain to grace and rhythmical movement in the less technical passages. Marginal topics, conveniently adjusted to the text, give assistance especially welcome in this part of the work.

In his commentary, M. Ernout addresses himself, on the whole, decidedly to the scholar rather than to the general reader. There is much purely philological matter; the "parallel passage" at times becomes deadly; and one leaves the notes inclined to regret that the author had not spared us some of his morphological erudition and given instead,—what so few editions of Lucretius or of any other Latin writer do give,—larger measure of intelligent and incisive criticism, from a sympathetic, common-sense, modern point of view, of the subject-matter of the book. Perhaps this is asking something beyond the professed scope of the edition (cf. Introduction, p. 4); but then why interpolate a linguistic commentary with philosophical and scientific flotsam?

Carefully prepared indices of phrases discussed and passages cited from Lucretius make easy of access the information contained in the notes.

The proof-reading and typework in general are excellent throughout. A mistaken heading appears in the Introduction, p. 11: "c" should be uniform with "i" of p. 9?. Exceptional are slips like those on p. 18 (read "importants" and "Cyril").

H. W. LITCHFIELD.

AMHERST COLLEGE.

A Concordance to the Works of Horace, compiled and edited by
LANE COOPER, published by The Carnegie Institution of
Washington, Washington, 1916.

The compiler and editor of this concordance, Dr. LANE COOPER, Professor of the English Language and Literature in

Cornell University, needs no introduction to American classicists. On more than one occasion he has shown, by word and deed, that he is thoroughly imbued with a sense of the importance of the ancient classics, and, again, in the preface to this work, he states that one of his principal reasons for undertaking the labor was the "hope that a concordance of a Latin poet, emanating from a teacher of English, might tend to strengthen the bonds of sympathy between devotees of the ancient classics and students of modern literature; for", continues he, "unless such bonds are constantly renewed, the study of modern literature, at least, is prone to become one-sided or unduly sentimental, or to go entirely astray." The method employed in the compilation of this work was substantially the same as that which was followed in the preparation of the author's Concordance of Wordsworth. "It has been his desire", the author says, "to perfect and, as in the present case, to exemplify a method by which works of this description may be produced quickly and with a great saving of energy, through organization of effort, the collaboration of many hands, and the use of mechanical devices for the attainment of speed and accuracy in recording." The details of the method for Horace have been set forth in printed instructions, copies of which may be had from the editor at Ithaca, New York. The preparation of the original slips on which the present Concordance is based was intrusted to a corps of eighteen collaborators. The editing of these slips with a view to improving the context wherever necessary, and the production of the slips that contained the variant readings, was the work of Professor COOPER. A number of the eighteen collaborators, with other friends and students of the editor, gave aid in the first stages of the alphabetical ordering of slips, and Miss Mary A. Ewer directed special efforts to making the record exact and complete.

The Concordance to the Works of Horace is a work of considerable size. On 593 small-quarto pages, it contains, in addition to the catchwords in bold-faced type, about 45,000 references and nearly the same number of quotations. The methods employed in the production of the Concordance are so well calculated to eliminate error, the surface indications of excellence are so striking, and the statements of the author as to the efforts that were made to secure completeness and accuracy are so reassuring, that there was every temptation for the reviewer to limit himself to merely a perfunctory examination of the work. But considerations of justice to author, reader and publisher alike made it imperative to institute some sort of a serious test. The very best test of an index or of a concordance is the actual use of the work for the purposes for which it was intended. To approximate the conditions of such a test, the writer selected portions from various parts

of Horace's works, looked up each word in the Concordance, examined the illustrative quotations wherever given, and verified the references. The passages selected were Carm. 1. 11 (entire); 3. 3 (entire); Serm. 1. 9 (lines 1-15); 2. 1 (lines 1-15); Epist. 1. 1 (lines 1-15); and Epist. 2. 2 (lines 1-51). There are more than one thousand words in these selections, and incidentally scores of other citations and references were examined, so that the test involved more than one thousand consultations of the Concordance and covered more than one forty-fifth of the entire volume. The result of the test, it should be said at once, was a striking confirmation of the initial impressions as to the superior merits of the work. Before proceeding to speak of these merits at greater length, it seems best to comment on certain features of the work that one might wish to see modified in concordances that may in the future be patterned after this one.

In the first place, a plea may here be registered for a diminution in the list of words that are cited without context. Surely, if *tibi* and all the other forms of *tu* are cited with their full context, *tu*, which is not so frequent as *tibi*, deserves the same treatment; and, if all the other forms of *ille* are cited with context, *ille* itself should be so cited. For a similar reason, one should desire the context of *se*; of *haec*, *hic*, *hoc*, *hunc*; of *quae*, *quam*, *qui*, *quid*, *quis*, *quo*, *quod*. Why should *est* and *sunt* alone out of all the forms of the copula be represented only by references? And, if some of the prepositions are cited with their context, why not all of them? Even thus a large enough list would remain which many scholars would be glad to see abridged: *ac*, *an*, *at*, *atque*, *aut*, *cum*, *cur*, *dum*, *et*, *iam*, *nam*, *ne*, *-ne*, *nec*, *neque*, *nisi*, *non*, *o*, *-que*, *quo* (adv.), *quod* (conj.), *sed*, *seu*, *si*, *sic*, *sive*, *tam*, *tamen*, *ut*, *-ve*, *vel*.

There are in the text of Horace many passages which are enclosed in quotation marks. When, in the Concordance, only the beginning or the end of such passages is cited, one of the quotation marks is regularly omitted; e. g., 'nil opus est te / circumagi (Serm. 1. 9. 16); nil sine magno / vita labore dedit mortalibus' (Serm. 1. 9. 59). This phenomenon is at first a little disconcerting until, after repeated consultations, one discovers that the omission is probably designed and is due to the mechanical process employed in the compilation of the book. It would have been a gain, if, in the Preface, attention had been called to this peculiarity.

A difficult problem in the making of a concordance is that of determining the amount of the context to be cited. The usual tendency is toward insufficiency of context. Professor COOPER has, upon the whole, admirably resisted this tendency, and scholars are greatly indebted to him for the amplitude of his citations. A trifle more generosity, however, in examples

like the following, would have made the work more ideal. In *nonne*, *cupidinibus statuat natura modum quem* (under *quem*, Serm. 1. 2. 111), both *nonne* and *quem* are suspended in mid-air; *nonne* requires its complement *plus prodest*, and *quem* becomes more intelligible by the addition of *quaerere*. *mente quatit solida neque Auster* (under *mente*, Carm. 3. 3. 4) would have been improved by the presence of *non* as cited under *quatit*, and still more satisfactory would have been the citation given under *solida*: *non voltus instantis tyranni / mente quatit solida neque Auster*. *Auster* would have been illuminating at the head of *dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae* (under *dux*, Carm. 3. 3. 5). In *catulos ferae / celent inultae* (under *catulos*, *ferae*, *celent* and *inultae*, Carm. 3. 3. 41-42), one misses the *dum* to indicate the nature of the subjunctive. *quam cogere humanos in usus* (under *cogere*, *humanos* and *usus*, Carm. 3. 3. 51) would be much clearer if *spernere fortior* preceded. *tecum sic agat* (under *agat*, Epist. 2. 2. 3) is made ambiguous by the suppression of the word *siquis*. *castellum evertere praetor / nescio quod cupiens hortari coepit* (under *hortari* and *coepit*, Epist. 2. 2. 35) is incomplete without the word *eundem*, which is the object of *hortari* and follows *coepit* in the text of Horace.

A closely related but much easier problem is that of the maintenance of consistency with respect to the amount of a given context that is cited under the various words which compose that context. When once certain words have been chosen as constituting a suitable context, there is an obvious advantage in adhering strictly to this context. The editor seems not to have made this an inviolable rule. For example, under *hac*, Carm. 3. 3. 9, he has selected *hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules / enisus arces attigit igneas* as a satisfactory context and has adhered to this context under *arte*, *Pollux* and *attigit*; but, greatly to the detriment of the sense, he has eliminated the words *hac arte Pollux et* under *vagus*, *Hercules*, *enisus*, *arces* and *igneas*. Again, under *recumbens*, Carm. 3. 3. 11, the author has admitted *quos inter Augustus recumbens / purpureo bibet ore nectar*,—an eminently satisfactory context: but under *quos* and *Augustus* only *quos inter Augustus recumbens* is cited; under *purpureo*, *ore* and *nectar*, *purpureo bibet ore nectar* is given; and under *bibet*, the unsatisfactory *Augustus recumbens / purpureo bibet ore nectar* appears. Under *Priami*, Carm. 3. 3. 26, *nec Priami domus / periura pugnacis Achivos / Hectoreis opibus refringit* is chosen as the citation, and the same citation reappears under *domus*, *periura*, *Achivos* and *refringit*; but under *pugnacis* the *nec* is omitted, and under *Hectoreis* and *opibus* the passage is abridged to *pugnacis Achivos / Hectoreis opibus refringit*.

In the matter of variants, the editor's laudable desire has been to secure the utmost possible completeness, but it is hard

to see what good has been accomplished by the inclusion of variants that could not possibly have stood in the Horatian text. So under *nihil* one meets the following: "nil [?nihil] sine magno / vita labore [?labore vita] dedit mortalibus." *? var. Serm. 1. 9. 59*. The same, with but a change in the numbering of the verse, recurs under *labore* and *vita*. But *nihil* and *labore vita* are both unmetered. A more glaring example is found in connection with *Epist. 2. 2. 18*. In addition to the regular text, *prudens emisti vitiosum, dicta tibi est lex*, this same text with the unmeterical variants *dicta est tibi lex* and *dicta tibi lex est* respectively is twice cited under *dicta*, *tibi* and *lex* each, and six lines have thus been wasted.

"The separation of words spelled alike but of different meanings, and of the same grammatical forms with slightly different functions," is regarded by the author as a work of supererogation, though, as a matter of fact, he has for the most part endeavored to carry out such a separation. In the case of words like *ut*, *quid* and *quod*, of which only the references are given, the user of the book, in order to determine the method of classification, is compelled to look up a number of the references under each rubric. This may be a task of considerable magnitude, and in some instances one cannot be sure of the precise nature of the examples that are grouped under a particular rubric until one has examined all of the examples in their proper context. In the case of words that are cited with their context, the nature of the categories may, as a rule, readily be seen from the citations themselves. An occasional oversight in classification has been noted. To say nothing of *gratum* in *o diva, gratum quae regis Antium, Carm. 1. 35. 1*, which is plainly an adjective and describes Antium, but which seems to have gotten into the wrong company in the Concordance, *omne* in *quando et priores hinc Lamias ferunt / denominatos et nepotum / per memores genus omne fastos, Carm. 3. 17. 4*, is listed as a nominative, though the word *genus* of this passage is correctly classified as an accusative. *Super* in *quereris super hoc etiam, Epist. 2. 2. 24*, is placed under the ablative examples of *super*, whereas the *hoc* of this passage is placed under the accusatives. In *unde laboris / plus haurire mali est quam ex re decerpere fructus, Serm. 1. 2. 78-79*, *plus* is the accusative and does not belong to a category different from the one that follows it in the Concordance.

It would be very unjust to the editor not to state that the infelicities that have been noted here and there in the Concordance vanish when viewed in their proper perspective, and it must be conceded that as to some, at least, of the suggestions that are contained in the preceding paragraphs, there may be a difference of opinion. In any case, the fact remains that the Concordance to the Works of Horace is a work of rare com-

pletteness and accuracy. Of the more than thousand words that formed the basis of the present test, every one was found duly recorded. In the vastly more than thousand references that were verified, not an error was discovered. In the approximately one thousand illustrative quotations that were examined, there was noticed but a single misprint; the "r" of *iurgares* was omitted in the citation, under *te*, of Epist. 2. 2. 22, *ne mea saevos / iurgares ad te quod epistula nulla rediret*. To the amplitude of the individual quotations, witness has been borne above. The typography of the book is excellent, and the quality and the color of the paper leave nothing to be desired. In short, the editor, his assistants and the Carnegie Institution of Washington are to be congratulated on the success of their undertaking, and they may rest assured that by "the doing of this work" they have earned "the gratitude of scholars for generations to come."

C. W. E. MILLER.

Studies in the Diction of the *Sermo Amatorius* in Roman Comedy. By KEITH PRESTON. University of Chicago Dissertation, 1916. Pp. 67.

This is an interesting and well considered study of the vocabulary of Roman lovers as it appears in Plautus and Terence. Pichon had already done much for this subject in his well known *De Sermone Amatorio apud Latinos Elegiarum Scriptores*. Dr. Preston has gone further into the detailed discussion of usage and has rendered his work particularly valuable by full citation and analysis of the same sphere in Greek. I am inclined to think that he could have rendered his discussion still more valuable if he had given the same close attention also to the amatory vocabulary of the elegy. For instance, on p. 42, his discussion of *cadere* in the erotic sense, 'tumbling', as Ophelia says, should include the most striking example of its use in classical literature. This is found in Sulpicia's bitter gibe at her lover (Tibullus IV, 10, 1):

Gratum est, securus multum quod iam tibi de me
permittis, subito ne male inepta cadam.

I have discussed the use of the word here at considerable length in my own note on the passage (Tibullus, p. 513).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XXXIX (1915).

Quelques remarques sur l'historicité de Tite-Live, XXI-XLV (5-23). E. Cavaignac takes exception to the slighting statements made by Kahrstedt and by Strehl and Soltau as to the use of sources by Livy and his accuracy. He cites a long list of events from XXI-XLV for which he postulates good and early sources.

Décrets de Nikopolis d'Épire (24-28). B. Haussoullier comments upon one of the five fragments of a Greek inscription published in 1913 by M. Alex. Philadelpheus in Fouilles de Nikopolis. The inscription is important as giving part of the first Nikopolis decree that has been found. It also gives the title of the only functionary thus far known there, a *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*.

Les communiqués de César (29-49). S. Reinach examines with keen insight the first book of the Commentaries, and concludes that Caesar did not write and publish the first book of the Commentaries after the war, but that he republished it then. Among many proofs adduced, the two strongest are, 1 the irreconcilable contradictions between Caesar's statements in I, 2 and I, 30, and that in I, 31 as to the reasons for the Helvetic migration, and 2 the complimentary terms (I, 52) used about P. Crassus, which, had that part of Book I been written in 51 b. c., three years after the death of Crassus and his father at Carrhae, would not have been then by any means employed.

Notes critiques aux chapitres de Pline relatifs à l'histoire de l'art (50-78). A. Reinach continues his discussion (Rev. de Phil. 1914, 245-254). In section III the chronology of the Theban school is taken up; in IV is a denial that there were two Nikiases or two Praxiteleses; in V, Aëtion and the painting of the marriage of Alexander and Roxane are discussed; in VI, the Paralos and Hammonias of Protogenes are explained; in VII, M. R. joins those critics who believe that Apelles painted two Aphrodites.

Bulletin bibliographique (79-80).

T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura, Liber quartus (81-245). An edition of the fourth book of Lucretius by Alfred Ernout, with Introduction (81-99), Text and Translation on opposite pages (100-171) and Notes (172-245).

Bulletin bibliographique (246-247).

Euripide, *Iphigénie à Aulis*, v. 1179 (249-255). R. Cahen adds some justificatory comments on Dindorf's change of

1179 Τοιόνδε μισθὸν καταλιπὼν πρὸς τοὺς δόμους.
1180 Ἐπεὶ βραχεῖας κτλ.

to

1179 Τοιόνδε μισθὸν καταλιπὼν πρὸς τοὺς δόμους
1180 ἐπεὶ βραχεῖας κτλ.

Horace, Sat. I, 1, v. 61 (256-258). A. Cartault commends the change made by M. Paul Lejay in his edition of the Satires of *at* to *ut* in line 61, but thinks the sense demands a change from a period to a comma in the punctuation at the end of line 60.

Marciana silva (259-260). F. Cumont shows that the *Marcianae silvae* of Ammianus Marcellinus and the *silva Marciana* of the Tabula Peutingeriana are in Greek sources respectively, Ἐρκύνιοι δρυμοί and Ἐρκυνία ὄλη. He thinks that the strange word *Hercynia* might easily have been copied as *Marciana*, but that more probably this name, which was used by the Gauls in the 4th century for the Black Forest, was extended by popular etymology.

L'ère byzantine et Théophile d'Édesse (260-263). F. Cumont adds a few chronological details to the articles of Serruys in Rev. de Phil. XXXI, 151-189 and 251-264.

Bulletin bibliographique (264).

Revue des revues et publications d'Académies (publiés en 1914) relatives à l'antiquité classique (1-182).

Tables de la Revue des revues (183-196).

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

R. V. D. MAGOFFIN.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLIV (1916).

Fascicolo 3.

La tirannide degli Ortagoridi alla luce di un nuovo documento (369-378). Vincenzo Costanzi examines this question on the basis of Oxyrhynchus Papyri XI, n. 1365, which is the fragment of a work concerned with the dynasty of Sicyon. The author is not known and the information he gives does not appear to be of any great value.

Equos troianus sive de vetere Romanorum fabula ex Hellenisticis expressa (379-397). A. Rostagni thinks that scholars have erred in their belief that the two old favorites of the Roman Stage by this name were adapted from an original belonging to the great age of the Greek Drama. He

concludes rather that the original was an Alexandrian tragedy of the same name to which Dioscorides refers, A. P. V 138.

Questionelle probiane, II (398-405). M. L. de Gubernatis discusses the idiom, *in potestatem fuisse*.

Ad Eronda IV 75 (406-408). F. Nencini contributes a note on the meaning of *θεων ψαύειν*.

La fine del regno di Seleuco Nicatore (409-423). G. Corradi concludes his discussion of this subject (cf. pag. 297).

Note al 'Culex' (424-427). Ettore de Marchi discusses Culex 243-247.

Lucretiana (428-444). U. Moricca discusses a number of passages of Lucretius.

Recensioni (445-460).

Note bibliografiche (460-466).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (467-477).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (478-480).

Fascicolo 4.

Notizie di papiri ercolanesi inediti (481-484). Domenico Bassi examines Papyrus 1636 and finds that it appears to be fragments of a treatise on rhetoric.

Gli scolii a Teocrito (485-511). Francesco Garin examines and discusses the Scholia on Theocritus as they appear in the various editions from Callierges to Wendel (1516-1914).

Italica (512). Edwin W. Fay adds a brief etymological note to his article in vol. xlili, 614-617.

La natura dell'accento greco primitivo ed alcuni fenomeni fonetici e morfologici (513-541). Lorenzo Dalmasso investigates the genitive singular of the second declension in Latin and Greek.

L'iscrizione osca della ghianda litica di Altilia (Saepinum) (542-546). Francesco Ribezzo again takes up this much discussed inscription; see for instance Fay's article xlili, 614-617.

Quibus temporibus fuerint A. Gellius et M. Valerius Probus disputatur (547-554). Benedetto Romano after reviewing the literature of the subject states his belief that the Probus whose scholars and friends were known personally to Gellius was the famous grammarian and critic M. Valerius Probus.

Emendamento a Pitica XI, 55 (555). Luigi Cerrato changes δ δ' in Pythian XI, 55 to $\delta\prime$.

Recensioni (556-574).

Note bibliografiche (575-578).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (579-589).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (590-592).

Vol. XLV (1917). Fascicolo 1.

Questioni e postille intorno alla sintassi di concordanza in latino (1-15). A. Gandiglio discusses at length the law governing the agreement of the predicate in sentences in which the subject is of the type Corioli *vetus oppidum* and *vetus oppidum Corioli*. The author makes a convincing plea for his own views on this subject as opposed to those of Stegmann in the first volume of the second edition of Kühner's *Satzlehre*.

Per il testo di Pap. Giessen 40, col. I (*Constitutio Antonina de civitate peregrinis danda*) (16-23). A. Beltrami transcribes this text as it appears in pap. Giessen 40 and adds a commentary.

Note filologiche sul "Secretum" del Petrarca (24-37). R. Sabbadini thinks that Petrarch's Secretum is the most sincere of all his works. So far, however, as the text is concerned, it is largely a cento from Cicero's Tusculans. It was composed at Vaucluse in 1342-3 and revised at Milan in 1353 or later. Interesting is the list of classical authors cited in this work.

Il codice Bresciano di Tibullo (38-69). F. Calonghi examines this manuscript and finds it to be closely related to the Vossianus V. One may have been copied from the other, but Calonghi thinks it more likely that the similarity between them is due to a common archetype.

Anecdota Latina (70-98). Giovanni Pesenti takes up again the Codex Monacensis Lat. 807 (M), especially that portion which was written by Poliziano in 1491. This contains notes with regard to his journey, the various libraries which he visited, but above all extracts from a number of valuable manuscripts which since then have been lost. Pesenti devotes particular attention to a very valuable codex of the Grammatici Latini now no longer existing, which contained among other things the work of Papirinus.

Greco, Siriaco, Arabo e Filosofia greca (99-103). C. O. Zuretti has a brief article on Furlani's *Contributi alla storia della filosofia greca in Oriente*.

Senecana (104-107). Umberto Moricca emends certain passages in Seneca's prose works.

Recensioni (108-152).

Note bibliografiche (153-157).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (158-172).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (173-176).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BRIEF MENTION.

As I announced in the last number of the Journal, p. 222, the theme of my quarterly musings was to have been the various shiftings and divergencies in the point of view that I had noticed in myself and others. But the necessity of cutting short the superfluities of *Brief Mention* left my preamble somewhat in the air, and the thread that ran through the illustrations of the theme could hardly have been discerned, except by those who are accustomed to follow Pindar in his circling weft. I began by telling what Odysseus and Penelope are to me, what they are to Mr. THOMSON, whose *Studies in the Odyssey* formed the subject of the next section; and that led up to the exposition of another diversity of view, which I proceed to redeem from the printer's galleys in which it has been imprisoned all these months.

The next difference then as to the point of view between Mr. THOMSON and myself is a much smaller matter. In the course of his rambles through Greek territory, picking up the threads that have been detached from the divine vestments of Odysseus and Penelope, happily or unhappily woven into human habiliments, Mr. THOMSON gravely informs us (p. 38) in gazetteer style that Kalaureia is 'a little island in the Saronic Gulf not far from Methana'. To a Greek scholar who has ever read the life of Demosthenes, Kalaureia needs no gazetteer. It was in this island that the great orator foiled the Macedonian's assassin. It was to this little island, the modern Poros, that I surrendered an afternoon of my Sixty Days in Greece (*Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1897, p. 207) and several pages of the Journal (XXXIII 363-5), and the charm comes back with one chapter of Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's new book, *A Man of Athens* (Houghton Mifflin Co.) but only that one chapter. The Athens of to-day is not a pleasant object of contemplation, and although the scene is laid in the time of the Balkan War, when the pulse of all lovers of Greece beat high, the picture of Athenian society is too photographically, too graphophonically exact to awaken the longing Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's other book called forth. One resents the everyday chatter, the everyday figures, the crowded stage, the cosmopolitan culture, the afternoon teas, the criticism of bad French, the slur cast upon Lancashire English, the general up-to-dateness. Of course, there is an artistic design in all this. It is intended to bring out in bold relief the figure of the hero who

is not an Athenian, but a sturdy Porote. Still I am not to be tempted, as I was before, to overstep the limits a philological journal ought to observe.

In the medley of books with which my cage is littered there is a volume bound in pigskin, that wonderful material which is proof against superheated houses and noxious gases,—M. A. Mureti *Orationes*, *Epistolae Hymnique Sacri*, *Lipsiae, Sump-tibus Viduae Gothofredi Grossii MDCLX*, acquired in the early days when I had a mania for Latin composition, an art in which Muretus was a past master. I soon tired of Muretus and his elegances. Justus Lipsius was more to my native bad taste. Perhaps I was prejudiced against Muretus because in one of his letters he warned young scholars against the art of dipping in which Andrew Lang was to shew himself such an adept, an art without which there would have been no joy in my own life. If some of my friends think that I have lost myself in *Brief Mention*, others are of the opinion that I have found myself there. And what else, pray, are Muretus' own 'Variae Lectiones'? Now apropos of the commonplace as to the divergent points of view, which I have been illustrating, one of Muretus' orations came up to my mind. Not long ago I was looking with undisguised horror at the Lusitania medal—horror heightened by the sight of the wonderful model of the boat, when I bethought me of the words in which Muretus extolled what some people still call the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. And this is the way in which the gentle humanist, who was capable of writing affectionate letters, almost deliquescent letters, to his young friends, spoke of that dreadful night: 'Qua nocte stellas equidem ipsas luxisse nitidius arbitror et flumen Sequanae maiores undas volvisse quo citius illa impurorum hominum cadavera evolveret et exoneraret in mare.' And then we are told not to believe in the wholesale butchery of the Peloponnesian War and taught to juggle with the Greek numerals.

There is an old story which in old days I loved to embroider for my intimates, that in a circle of devout Emersonians the hierophant read aloud a sentence in which the seer declared Chaucer to be the 'tar-pot' of English literature. The mystic word was variously interpreted by various members until one skeptical soul demanded to see the text wherein was written not 'tar-pot' but 'tap-root'. The same process goes on everywhere in exegesis. In the original context 'hitching one's wagon to a star' had reference to modern advance in mechanical science, though in Emerson the context makes little odds. I knew a lover of the Bible who found an exquisite touch in

Ezekiel's 'shadowing shroud' (31. 3); and doubtless there are many passages in the classics that are similarly misinterpreted. Pindar is a fine field, and I have recently been summoned to contemplate assaults old and new that have been made upon an exegesis of a text which I had made a pivot of Pindar's art (I. E. xxxvi), and which I thought so simple that I quoted my version of it quite as a matter of course in a popular magazine, P. 9, 82-3: *βαῖα δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς*. 'To broider a few things among many, that is a hearing for the wise'. To me ἀκοά was the equivalent of the ἀκρόαμα of a later day—'Ohrenschmaus' as the Germans call it. 'Hearing' no more requires an adjective than does 'sight' in the familiar saying 'a sight for sore eyes'. But since that day Wilamowitz, in his Hieron u. Pindaros, Szb. der k. Preuss. Ak. der Wiss., 1901, p. 200, has said in his emphatic way, 'Mit ἀκοά ist in keiner Richtung etwas anzufangen', and reads ἀκόνα after the notorious ἀκόνας λιγυρᾶς of O. 6, 82—a stone of stumbling to sundry critics who would fain read instead ἀκοᾶς, a stone of stumbling, which Wilamowitz has made the head of the corner. With his rare gift of turning Pindar's diamonds into homely carbon—by way, as I have suggested, of exposing Pindar's poverty of thought (A. J. P. XXXI 133)—he renders the whole passage thus: 'Von grossen Thaten ist es leicht lange zu erzählen; aber kleines auszuschmücken reizt (ἀκόνα) den guten Dichter, denn beide Male entscheidet der καιρός, das rechte Maass'. Wilamowitz's 'kleines' refers to the story of the bride of Apollo—no famous legend that ('nicht eben berühmt'). Another Pindaric scholar in a private letter also makes *βαῖα* refer to the 'fluffy stuff' out of which Pindar has woven the beautiful tale of the Huntress Queen, and translates 'Poets often hear it said that they embellish at inordinate length even matters of little import'. Wilamowitz does not translate *ἐν μακροῖσι*¹ unless 'aus-' in 'ausschmücken' be considered a translation. My correspondent takes it as equivalent to διὰ μακρὸν, and brings the saying into line with the familiar charge against the sophists, citing Plato, Phaedr. 268 c: *ἐπιστρατεύεσθαι περὶ σμικροῦ πράγματος ρῆσεις παμμήκεις ποιεῖν*. Simonides was a forerunner of the sophists

¹ The equation *ἐν μακροῖσι*—διὰ μακρῷ is not substantiated by any example in EMILY HELEN DUTTON's Chicago Dissertation, an elaborate treatise of 202 pp., entitled *Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases*, διά, διπ, ἐκ, εἰς, ἐν. ἐν διλγψ is there and ἐν διλγψ, not ἐν μακροῖσι. The subject of the Greek prepositions has interested me for many years, as the annals of the Journal testify, but except for a solitary reference εἰς κενὸν θέραμον, so far as Miss DUTTON is concerned. By the way, εἰς κενὸν (Gal. 2, 2) is not in Miss DUTTON's lists, but it is only fair to add that the Greek of the N. T. is not within her purview. More surprising, however, is the omission of διὰ πασῶν which can only be accounted for on the theory that we have here a silent protest against the line 'the diapason closing full in man'. To be really valuable, all such collections should be exhaustive. And that is just the trouble.

and would have admitted the charge gladly. But Pindar never underrates his themes. *βαιά* here is simply *δλίγα* without any connotation of 'slight' common as that connotation is. There is no such connotation in Aeschyl. Pers. 1023 *βαιά γ' ὡς ἀπὸ πολλῶν*, nor in Ar. Ach. 2, *ησθην δὲ βαιά, πάνν γε βαιά, τέτταρα*, nor in *Σαπφοῖς βαιά μὲν ἀλλὰ ρόδα*. In the early days of Pindaric interpretation, the national importance of the great games was not appreciated. In 1693 a French critic considered Greek athletes 'poor creatures', and it is no wonder that he construed the Pindaric passage somewhat as Wilamowitz has done:

Surquoy il faut se souvenir que nous avons dit auparavant, que Pindare avoit à louer des personnes qui pour l'ordinaire avoient si peu de merite, qu'il n'y avoit rien à dire d'eux; Et qu'ainsi il falloit bien qu'il cherchast de la matiere au dehors, sur laquelle il pût s'élever; parce que ces miserables Athletes qu'il louoit, vouloient avoir des Odes fort longues pour leur argent. Et c'est en cela que paroît principalement l'artifice de Pindare, *de sçavoir*, comme il dit, *dire beaucoup de grandes choses sur de petits sujets*.

βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν.

Ce qu'il appelle encore *l'effet d'un genie extraordinaire*.

ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς.

Blondel, *Comparaison de Pindare et d'Horace*. A Amsterdam, MDCLXXXIII, p. 59.

Pindar's own testimony to the greatness of the games, the greatness of their rewards and the limitation of the lyric art abounds. *μεγάλαι ἀρεταί* (P. 9, 76)¹ he calls the achievements of Blondel's 'miserable athletes'. *μάσσον' ἡ ὡς ἰδέμεν*, he cries (O. 13, 115). *μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ* (N. 1, 11). And as for *βαιά* Pindar himself, being like his own Aineas an *ἄγγελος ὄρθος*, a *σκυτάλα Μοισᾶν* (O. 6. 91), fails like other messengers to tell all. *πολλῶν παρόντων δλίγ' ἀπαγγέλλω κακά*, says the messenger in the Persae 331 and so the Paidagogos in Soph. El. 688: *ἐν πολλοῖσι παῦρά σοι λέγω*. The lyric poet is always out of breath. He is a sectary of Apollo, one of the *ἐπειγόμενοι θεοί*. *βραχύ μοι στόρα*, he declares (N. 10, 18), *πάντ' ἀναγγήσασθαι*, and in the same ode, v. 45: *μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆσαι σχολᾶς*, and at the close of O. 13 bids himself swim with light feet out of this sea of glory. But why 'rattle citations' (A. J. P. XXIV 234)? Most important of all is the utterance: *μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός* (N. 4, 32), the *τεθμός* that commands him *βαιὰ . . . ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν*. So that I am not prepared to abandon an interpretation that has commended itself to so many lovers of Pindar, and one moreover to which I have committed myself again and again.

¹ So *μεγάλαι ἀλκαῖ*, N. 7, 12.

Of the shifting of the point of view, the divergence of attitude, on which I have been dwelling, there is no more striking illustration than that which is furnished by the interpretation of Pindar of which I have given a small sample. And as to the estimate of Pindar himself, two lively illustrations have fallen under my notice of late, which I will not consign to the wastebasket, the 'aeternum exilium' of so many *Brief Mentions*. I have recently made the acquaintance of a scholar who has long found that Pindar answers to every phase of life, every turn of social and literary intercourse, whereas the Dean of Barnard reviewing in happy mood her early classical studies remembers Pindar only as very difficult, thus recalling the criticism of the Atlantic Monthly, which thirty-odd years ago had only this to say about a work into which the writer had put much of his soul, 'The apparatus is extensive enough to give the moderate Greek scholar some hope of mastering this knotty author'—'knotty author' not 'love-knotty' poet. But this very divergence, this very shifting has in it a note of assurance for the perpetuity of our studies. 'Gerade in der Unendlichkeit', says Boeckh, 'liegt das Wesen der Wissenschaft. Wo die Unendlichkeit aufhört ist die Wissenschaft zu Ende'—and the infinite variety is made certain for all time by the infinite variety of that charm which no custom can stale and for which there are new customers, whether few or many, in every generation.

Reading not long ago the Electra of Sophocles, I was struck with the frequent occurrence of the word *φρονεῖν* and my thoughts went back to Professor KNAPP's article in the Journal, *A Point in the Interpretation of the Antigone of Sophocles* (A. J. P. XXXVII 300–316). In this article the author lays a great deal of stress on the recurrence of *φρονεῖν* in its bearing on the moot point of Antigone's responsibility. Now 'recurrent' has the same effect on my nerves as 'Deformed' on the nerves of Dogberry. Mezger made an organon of the recurrent word in his interpretation of Pindar, and I am reminded of battles long ago in which Pindaric scholars were hotly engaged (see my Pindar, I. E. 1 foll., A. J. P. II 497, XII 96, XV 506 al.). I have never set myself resolutely against the importance of the recurrent word. 'Cedendo victor abibis', as Ovid says of quite a different duel—'sans témoins et sans armes'. But the importance must not be exaggerated until it becomes a canon. Recurrence is determined sometimes impersonally as for instance in the favourite preposition business (A. J. P. XXIII 27), sometimes personally as in emotional passages. In the latter case the goddess *Ποικλία*, to which rhetorical prose pays such homage (A. J. P. XXI 92, XXXV 231), has little

sway, rhythm much more. The plays of Sophocles in which the question of *φρόνησις* would naturally be prominent, take the lead in the number of *φρονεῖν*'s, if I may trust a rough count, in the following order—Ajax, which deals with the recovery of the hero from madness; the Antigone—for which Professor KNAPP may be consulted—followed close by the Oedipus Tyrannus, in which the wisdom of the wise is confounded; the Electra, in which we have a conflict between the practical sense of Chrysothemis and Klytaimestra and the ideal sense of the heroine. But what does all this amount to? Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh—which is the stately A. V. of Matt. 12, 34: *ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ*, or in the racy language of Luther, which sometimes commends itself by its homely rendering of a homely text (A. J. P. XVI 127, XXII 107): *Wes das Herz voll ist, des geht der Mund über.* But one remembers that Our Lord is addressing a generation of vipers and not a swarm of harmless γνωμοθόμοβικες. To quote myself, as I often do unconsciously (A. J. P. XXXVI 482), 'No high poetry is exhausted by its recurrent burdens, its catch-words, its key verses', (I. E. lvii) and Fraccaroli has preached a sermon to the same effect (A. J. P. XV 507).

Some months ago I said with Job—whom I resemble in nothing except a long life and a tendency to tropical language—'I shall die in my nest' and my nest is built in the garden of the Anthology. To be sure, the pleasure of the garden is somewhat marred, as it was not in the summer of 1916, by the mopping and mowing conjectural critics that grin at one from the trenches of Stadtmüller's edition. Still the Anthology is a real pleasance full of varied enjoyment with flowers of all hue and *<here and there>* a rose. But my peaceful repose has been broken of late by raucous shouts of Thukydides and Euripides to whom I had said good-bye for ever so far as print goes. But these are war times. One must submit to 'extras'—and so I proceed to call attention to the appearance and give a general notion of the contents of several monographs, which in other days and at other hands might have received the consideration which they deserve. Here they are in the order in which they lie on my desk.

The subject of Professor MAURICE HUTTON's paper (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Vol. IX, 1916) is *Thucydides and History*. Professor HUTTON is a liegeman of Herodotus, as he has shewn on several occasions, and his testimony is therefore suspect. To him as to so many others,

Thucydides is the first scientific historian, yet not so severely scientific as not to be dramatic, and yet he echoes Mahaffy's 'sober truth' when he remarks that 'in recounting the butchery of Boeotian babes at the hands of the Thracians (VII 26) Thucydides' emotion is discernible only in the contortions and crabbedness of his syntax', a railing accusation for the chapter is simplicity itself.¹ One must thank Heaven that Professor HUTTON has not accounted for Thucydides' coldness by his Thracian blood as others have accounted for Thucydides' language by his Thracian environment (A. J. P. XXXIII 237). Many years ago Karl Blind claimed Thucydides as a German, and his praise of efficiency and his calm record of frightfulness will be charged to that score. Yet Thucydides actually deigns to add: *καὶ συμφορὰ τῇ πόλει πάσῃ οὐδεμᾶς ἡστῶν μᾶλλον ἔτερας ἀδόκητός τε ἐπέπεσαν αὐτῇ καὶ δεινή*, whereas Herodotus, the kindly, who tells us of the falling of a roof which killed a hundred and nineteen children in Chios has not a sigh for their fate (VI 27). But much of the ground has recently been covered by my summary of Nestle (A. J. P. XXXVI 103 ff.). The modernism of Thucydides is a familiar theme in the English journals, and Professor HUTTON's paper is full of 'actualities' and full of reflexions. 'Professors and philosophers', says this representative of Our Lady of the Snows, 'are the worst of statesmen; they think that they can arrange the world with essays and lectures. They make bad Presidents'. But, as one who has been hard hit by some of the fashionable parallelisms of the newspapers, I decline to follow Professor HUTTON on this 'burning marble'. I am not prepared to accept the identification of the Southern cause in the Civil War with that of Prussian Junkerdom, and I have elsewhere made light of historical parallels.

And now for Euripides. 'Ecce iterum Crispinus adest', I am constrained to cry, and Aristophanes would have joined me in calling him the 'cobbler poet', if he had read Juvenal and been acquainted with Christian hagiology. Euripides—once more—nay, thrice more. First comes *A study of Archaism in Euripides* by a young Ph. D. of Columbia, Dr. MANNING. Of course *Archaism in Euripides* means nothing more than a Return to Aischylos—not an unfamiliar theme. There is no going back beyond Aischylos, no possibility of restoring the *ἀρχαιομελοδιῶνοφρννχίρατα* of Aischylos' forerunner Phrynicos, and the best thing about Thespis is the epigram in the Anthol-

¹ A better illustration of the correspondence between style and content will be found A. J. P. XVII 126, where it is said that one might attribute the peculiar twists and turns of the speech of the Mytilenaeans, Thuk. III, to the embarrassment of the traitorous allies of the Athenians.

ogy.¹ 'Archaic' has somehow a more formidable sound than old-fashioned. Perhaps Mid-Victorian might serve. When the critics woke up to the fact that Mr. Macmaster, born in 1852, was walking in the footsteps of Macaulay (b. 1800), no one called him archaic. Euripides was on any count little more than forty years younger than Aischylos, and brought out a play shortly after the *Oresteia*, the performance of which he must have witnessed. There is a double strain in Euripides, as we all know, and one is inclined to set down some of his archaisms to his aristocratic mother, Kleito. That he was not averse to the sonorities of Aischylos is strikingly shewn by Aiakos in the *Frogs*, in whose speech one might well have suspected a parody of Aischylos, but, as the Scholiast tells us, it is a burlesque of Euripides. The language of tragedy is a composite affair and Tycho Mommsen—who strangely enough is not cited by Dr. MANNING—has written an interesting chapter on what a wicked person might call the *sartago loquendi* of Euripides. The syntax of Euripides is now the syntax of the agora, now it is hyperepic. He misuses the terminal accusative damnably, whereat Aristophanes protests—but for that matter Sophokles overdoes the whence-case genitive and stretches the feminine negative. Euripides' harking back to the trochaic tetrameter of Aischylos is an old story. It is characteristic of the bookish poet that he studied Aischylos in his antre vast, where he doubtless kept his library. It is characteristic of his scornful spirit that he disdained to learn of Sophokles; characteristic of Sophokles' serene wisdom that he did not disdain to learn of his younger rival. But I am impatient to get back to my pleached bower of the Anthology in which I have taken refuge from these Tophetic times—and I am afraid that what I have written already may do injustice to Dr. MANNING, who has pushed the lines of his investigation farther than his authorities. But I dare not take up the chapters seriatim, lest I should tax the Journal as I did in the much to be regretted discourse on Paulus. Here at all events there will be no 'Paulo maiora canamus' nor any *βαιλὶς ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν*.

In his paper on the *Ethics of Euripides* (an off-print from Woodbridge's Archives of Philosophy May, 1916) Mr. RHYS CARPENTER begins with a quotation from Pindar τὸ δὲ φύη κράτιστον ἄπαν (O. 9, 107) which he translates 'Nature's way is ever the strongest and best' and then ashamed, as so many are, to quote Pindar, he adds 'Like much of his teaching the

¹ A. P. VII 410 (Dioskorides). It ends with an expansion of Pindar's ἄπαν εὐρύντος ἔργον: μυπλος αἰών | πολλὰ προσευρήσει χάτερα· τάμα δ' ἀμά.

aphorism has more strength than originality'. The same thing might be said of Plato's *τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν*, of the Stoic Doctrine 'Follow Nature.' To me Pindar, Plato and Persius are bound each to each by natural piety—not artificial parechesis. And despite Mr. CARPENTER's disparagement of Pindar as a thinker, it appears that poor Pindar's gnome is 'the keynote of Euripides' morality', and that 'the logical concept is quite as dominant there as in Greek sculpture'.

In the *Harvard Studies* of 1916 Dr. ARISTIDES EVANGELUS PHOUTRIDES maintains the thesis that far from causing the degeneracy of the Greek stage by his handling of the choral parts, Euripides has done his utmost to invest the chorus with its due significance. Another return to Aischylos—and the way of the return is paved with statistics. But I must hie me back to my garden, and as for the discussion of Thukydides and Euripides *τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐν "Αἰδον τοῖς κάτω μυθῆσομαι* for there must be an end some day to this autobiography, as a friend has dubbed *Brief Mention*.

Long before the present generation of grammarians came to the front, I had settled down to a view of the Greek historical present which seemed to satisfy the aesthetic conditions of usage. See my *Indiculus Syntacticus* s. v. A. J. P. XXXVI 485 to which add XX 228. The historical present, I said to myself, belongs to the cave-man period of language before there were any tenses, properly so-called, when there was only nothing but what is termed nowadays 'Aktionsart'.¹ This 'Aktionsart' answered all the purposes of past, present and future. But this loose use made it hard for the cave-man to pin his fellow down, and so a past tense was evolved, and what we call the historical present was relegated to the primitive sphere which continued to live on after 'Pyrrha sub antro' became a lady. Present for past became vulgar. Hence, I said, it is not found in Homer nor in the high lyric of Pindar. It had free course in the drama, resumed its rights in prose (A. J. P. XIV 480). As for Latin, the hot Italian blood never had any scruples (A. J. P. XIV 105). But in the absence of exhaustive statistics (A. J. P. XXIII 240), the behaviour of the historical present in English forbade formulation, though I have recorded here and there certain impressionistic statements as to its range in spoken English, in idiomatic English (XXIX 393). Now the lack of statistics has been supplied in a measure by Mr. J. M.

¹ Repudiated by Stahl, A. J. P. XXIX 389; comp. XXXVII 113.

STEADMAN in his treatise, *The Origin of the Historical Present in English* (Studies in Philology XIV University of N. C.)—and I append his results.

1. The historical present does not occur in Old English.
2. It occurs in the Latin writings of Englishmen of the eighth-eleventh centuries.
3. The historical present is consistently and repeatedly avoided in translating from Latin into Old English.
4. This use of the present appeared in written English at the beginning of the thirteenth century; it became fairly common before the end of the century; and by the end of the fourteenth century was used with the greatest freedom.

The question is very much complicated by the fact that our early literature is very largely a literature of translation and Mr. STEADMAN's title is disappointing, for he passes in review a number of theories but decides on none. Of course, as will appear from my previous discussions of the subject, I naturally inclined to Jespersen's view that the historical present has a native basis in English also—a native use which I supposed to be fostered by translation from Latin, for which we have a parallel in the literary use of the Latin infinitive, influenced in like manner by translation from Greek (A. J. P. XVII 520). But Mr. STEADMAN's statistics are disillusioning, so far as O. E. is concerned, unless one assumes that in O. E. the historical present was felt to be too vulgar for translation from the Latin.

W. P. M.: *Francisci Barbari De Re Uxorii Liber*. Nuova edizione per cura di ATILIO GNESOTTO. Padova: G. B. Randi, 1915. 105 pp. This is an excellent edition of the famous treatise on marriage written by the Venetian scholar and statesman Francesco Barbaro. It was written in the winter of 1415-16. The author was only about 17 years old, but thanks to two of his teachers, Zaccaria Trevisan and Guarino Guarini, he could draw upon all the wisdom of the ancients. One specially interesting fact is his familiarity with Plutarch—a fact which ought to be added to the store of learning in Professor HIRZEL's recent book (A. J. P. XXXIV 117). Two other classical writers who are very freely used are Cicero and Virgil. The borrowings of word or phrase are regularly indicated in the notes, though the editor seems to have overlooked a couple of bits of Virgil. 'Justissima tellus', p. 1, l. 9, comes from Geor. II 460, and the expression 'usque adeo in teneris assuecere multum est', p. 75, l. 17, from Geor. II 272.

ERRATA.

XXXVIII 46, l. 10, for 'origin' read 'original'. 55, l. 7, for 'favoured' read 'flavoured'. 70, l. 11, for 'the children of thy youth' read 'children of the youth'. 70, l. 2 from bottom, after 'aor.' insert 'inf'.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

Baker (Albert E.) A Shakespeare Dictionary. Pt. I, Julius Caesar. (Taunton: Borough Library) Author, June 1917. 10½ x 7½, pp. 32, 1s. od. net.

Blum (Alice). Oral French method; a new system for rapidly acquiring facility in the speaking of French. New York, *Doran*. 14 + 337 pp., il. 8°, \$2 net.

British Museum. Catalogue of Greek papyri in the British Museum. Vol. 5, ed. by H. I. Bell. London, *Quaritch*, June 17. 4to, 42s. net.

Bruce (Aline). Russian conversation made easy: a simple guide to the Russian language. London, *Larby*, July 1917. Cr. 8vo, 7¼ x 5, pp. 80, 1s. 6d net.

Burns (Cecil Delisle). Greek ideals. New York, *Macmillan*. 12 + 257 pp. 12°. \$2 net.

Caesar, Caius Julius. Caesar's Campaigns in Britain, de Bello Gallico Commentarii Quartus (XX-XXXVIII) et Quintus; ed. by T. Rice Holmes; with a vocabulary comp. by G. G. Loane. New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*. 160 pp. il. maps. 8°, 50 c. net.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Selected orations and letters; with introd., notes, vocabulary, and English-Latin exercises by Arth. W. Roberts and J. C. Rolfe. New York, *Scribner*, (c. '17). Front. double pl., por. maps (part double). 12°. (Roberts and Rolfe Latin ser.) \$1.50 net.

Corpus Scriptorum latinorum paravianum moderante Carolo Pascal: Catulli Carmina, recensuit Carolus Pascal. 2.25 L.

Caesaris De bello civili, recensuit Dominicus Bassi. 2.75.

Ciceronis De re publica, recensuit Carolus Pascal. 2.75.

Minucii Felicis Octavius, recensuit Aloysius Valmaggi. 1.25.

Taciti Germania, rec. Caesar Annibaldi. 1.25.

Plauti Stichus, ad codicem Ambrosianum, rec. C. O. Zuretti. 1.50.

Taciti Agricola, rec. Caesar Annibaldi. 1.25.

All bound. Turin, *Paravia*. For sale by G. E. Stechert & Co.

Cowles (Fk. Hewitt). Gaius Verres; an historical study. N. Y., *Longmans*, c. '17. 207 pp. O (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology). bds. \$1.50 spec. net.

Daniels (Fs.) French scientific reader; ed. with introd. notes and vocabulary. New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*. c. 16 + 748 pp. il. pls. por. D. (Oxford French ser., by American scholars). \$1.75 net.

English-Modern Greek and Modern Greek-English dictionary. New York, *Atlantis, inc.*, c. '17. 204 + 192 pp., maps, obl. 16° \$1.

Forbes (Neville). First Russian Book: a prac. manual of Russian declensions. 2d ed. London, *Milford*, June, 1917. Cr. 8vo. 7¾ x 5¾, pp. 224, 2s. 6d. net.

— Third Russian book; extracts from Aksakov, Grigorovich, Herzen, Saltykov; accented and ed. with full notes and complete vocabulary. New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*. 12 + 192 pp. D. \$1 net.

Freese (J. H.) A new pocket dictionary of the English and Russian languages; comp. from the best authorities: English-Russian. New York, *Dutton*. 12 + 331 pp. D. \$2 net.

Gairdner (W. H. T.) *Egyptian colloquial Arabic; a conversation grammar and reader.* London, *Heffer*, June, 1917. 8°. 9 x 5 3/4, pp. 314. 12s. 6d. net.

Gardiner (A. H.) and Peet (T. Eric). *The Inscriptions of Sinai.* Pt. I. *Introduction and plates.* Fol. 14 x 17 3/4. pp. 26 and 86 pl. 35s. net.

Gerson (Joannes), i. e. Jean le Charlier de Gerson. *The Ad Deum vadit of Jean Gerson, pub. from the manuscript Bibliothèque nationale, fonds fr. 24841, by D. Hobart Carnahan.* Urbana, Ill., *Univ. of Ill.* 155 pp. 4°. (Studies in language and literature.) pap., \$1.75.

Hall (J. Leslie). *English usage; studies in the history and uses of English words and phrases.* Chicago, *Scott, Foresman.* c. 1917. 339 pp. \$1.50 D.

Holy Scriptures (The). *According to the Masoretic text; a new translation.* London, *Routledge*, June, 1917. Cr. 8vo. Pp. 1151. 4s. net.

Homeri Opera recognoverunt D. B. Monro et T. W. Allen. *Tomus III. Odysseae libros I-XII continens. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit T. W. Allen. Editio altera.* (Oxford Classical texts.) London, *Milford*, July, 1917. Cr. 8vo 7 1/2 x 5 1/4, pp. 246, 3s. interleaved, 5s. 6d.; swd. 2s. 6d.

Kelso (Ja. Anderson) and Culley (Rev. D. E.) *Hebrew-English vocabulary to the Book of Genesis.* New York, *Scribner.* c. 8 + 48 pp. 8°, \$1 net.

Lucan. Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, *De bello civili; liber VIII;* ed. by J. P. Postgate. New York, *Putnam.* 112 + 146 pp. (Pitt press ser.) \$1 net.

Old Testament in Greek, accord. to the text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented fr. other uncial MSS. w. critical apparatus cont. variants of chief ancient authorities for text of the Septuagint. Vol. I. *The Octateuch: Pt. 4: Joshua, Judges and Ruth.* Ed. by A. E. Brooke and Norman McLean. *Camb. Univ. Pr.*, June, 1917. Demy 4to, 11 3/8 x 8 3/4, pp. 272, 15s. net.

Roberts (W. Rhys). *Greek civilization as a study for the people.* New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*, n. d. 13 pp. O. (Proceedings of the British Academy.) pap., 40c.

Stratton (George Malcolm). *Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle.* *Allen & U.*, July, 1917. 8vo, 8 1/2 x 6, pp. 227. 8s. 6d. net.

Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florens). *Apologeticus; the text of Oehler; annotated; with an introd. by J. E. B. Mayor; with a tr. by Alex. Souter.* New York, *Putnam.* 20 + 406 pp., O. \$3.75 net.

Van Ess (J.) *The Spoken Arabic of Mesopotamia.* London, *Milford*, June, 1917. Cr. 8vo. 7 1/2 x 5 3/4, pp. 262. 4s. 6d. net.

FRENCH.

Année Littéraire (L.) (1754-1790) comme intermédiaire en France des littératures étrangères. In-8, 164 pp. *F. Rieder.* (Bibliothèque de littérature comparée.) 4 fr.

Blanchard (Raphael). *La Mimophonie, son rôle dans le formation des langues.* In-8. *Ed. Champion*, 1 fr. 50.

Clédat (L.) *Manuel de phonétique et de morphologie historique du français.* In-12. *Hachette*, 4 fr.

Jeanroy (A.) *Bibliographie sommaire des chansonniers provençaux.* In-12. *Champion.* (Classiques français du moyen âge, no. 16.) 2 fr. 25.

Klionoff (Olga) et Thommeret (L.) *4000 verbes russes classés en 160 séries. Accompagnés de leurs principales formes de conjugaisons, substantifs, adjectifs correspondants. Textes, accentués et traduits.* In-8. *Rodstein*, 6 fr.

Legrand (Max-Albert). *L' Abrévi*, petit traité d'abréviation méthodique. In-12. 60 pp. *Jouve*, 1 fr. 50.

Loviot (Louis). *La Gazette de 1609* (réimpression textuelle avec notices). In-8, *Boccard*. 5 fr.

—. Auteurs et Livres anciens (XVI^e et XVII^e siècles). In-8 avec 23 facsimilés 4 pl. et 1 carte. *Boccard*. 20 fr.

Meillet (A.) *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*. In-12. *Hachette*. 3 fr. 50.

Pour parler marocain tout de suite. In-16, 35 pp. Perpignan, Imprimerie catalane. 1 fr. 50.

Publications de la Société suisse des Traditions populaires. 13. *Les Chansons Populaires Recueillies dans la Suisse Romande et Publiées sous les Auspices de la Société Suisse des Traditions Populaires par Arthur Rossar, Tome Premier. Société Suisse des Traditions populaires. Bâle, 1917. 160 pp. Agents for U. S. A.: G. E. Stechert & Co., New York. paper \$1.50.*

Van Tieghem (P.) *Ossian en France*, 2 vols. In-8. 44-544 pp. *F. Rieder*. (Bibliothèque de littérature comparée.) 15 fr.

Vékovitch (Mlle. de). *Dictionnaire serbe-français*. Avec prononciation figurée. In-12. *Rodstein*. 7 fr. 50.

Zielinska (Iza). *Manuel de langue polonaise*. Préface de Georges Bienaimé. In-12. 1916. *Polonia*, 3 bis, rue La Bruyère. 3 fr. 50.

ITALIAN.

Cappuccini (G.) *Vocabolario della lingua italiana*. Torino. 8°, pp. XII, 1820 a 3 colonne. L. 10. Legato, 12.

Cordara (Giulio Cesare). *Lettere di Giulio Cesare Cordara a Francesco Cancellier (1772-1785) pubblicate sugli autografi del Museo Britannico, con estratti dai "Commentari" e bibliografia cordariana a cura di Giuseppe Albertotti*. Padova, 4°. pp. XXXI 789, con 2 tavole e ritratti. L. 40.

Fomin (V.) *Dizionario russo-italiano e italiano-russo*, con la pronuncia figurata, seguito da un dizionario geografico e dei nomi propri, da un frasario e da due piccole grammatiche russa e italiana. Milano, 16°, p. x, 812, L. 11. 50.

Frisoni (G.) *Dizionario moderno italiano-spagnuolo e spagnuolo-italiano con speciale riguardo alle scienze, alla navigazione e al commercio. Parte italiana-spagnuola*. Milano, 16°, pp. XII, 1120 a 2 col. L. 9.50.

Lovera (R.) *Grammatica della lingua rumena*, coll'aggiunta di modelli di lettere e di un vocabolario delle voci più usuali. 3a ediz. corretta e ampliata. Milano, 16°, pp. VIII, 211. L. 2.50.

Malagoli (Giuseppe). *Crestomazia per secoli della letteratura italiana a uso degli istituti tecnici, delle scuole normali e commerciali*. Volume III. Parte II: Secolo XVIII. Firenze, 8°, pp. 260. L. 2.30.

Prati (Angelico). *L'italiano e il parlare della Valsugana: confronti per l'insegnamento della lingua nei comuni valsuganotti (Società filologica romana)*. Perugia, 8°, pp. 71. L. 1.50.

Sperandeo (P. G.) *La lingua russa: grammatica ed esercizi con la pronuncia figurata, con 3000 vocaboli della lingua parlata con le flessioni irregolari, una scelta di prose e poesie e un frasario*, 4a ediz. Milano, 16°, p. x, 274. L. 4.

Stampini (Ettore). *Studi di letteratura e filologia latina*, con una appendice di iscrizioni ed altri scritti in lingua latina. Torino, 8°, pagine IX, 447. L. 6.

Studi della Scuola Papirologica della R. Accademia scientifico-letteraria di Milano. Vol. II. Milano, 8°, pp. X, 288. L. 9.

SPANISH.

Aguado Pleye (Pedro). *Santa Maria de Salas en el siglo XIII. Estudios sobre algunas cantigas de Alfonso el Sabio*; un folleto en 4° de 98 páginas. Pes. 3.

Bermudez Devos (Manuel). *Gramatica elemental de la lengua castellana ó española*, tercera edición; un vol. en 8°. mayor de 161 págs. Pes. 6.

Cejador y Frauca (Julio). *Historia de la lengua y literatura castellanas, comprendidos los autores hispano-americanos*, tomo VI (Epoca del siglo XVIII: 1701-1829); un vol. en 4° de 466 págs. Pes. 10.

Sancho Bruño (Julian Vicente). *Gramatica comparada anglo-española (estudio critico de las oraciones impersonales)*; un folleto en 8° de 62 págs. Pes. 1.50.

Savi-López (Pablo). *Cervantes, traduccion del italiano por Antonio G. Solalinde*; un vol. en 8° de 260 págs. Pes. 3.50.

Urbina (Luis G.). *La literatura mexicana durante la guerra de la Independencia*; un vol. en 8° de 282 págs. Pes. 4.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aurner (Nellie Slayton). *An Analysis of the Interpretations of the Finnsburg Documents.* (University of Iowa Monographs, Humanistic Studies, Volume I, Number 6.) June, 1917. 8°, 36 pp., 30c.

Clédat (L.) *Manuel de Phonétique et de Morphologie Historique du Français.* Paris, *Hachette et Cie*, 1917. In-16, broché, 4 fr.

Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. No. XX. *Gaius Verres; An Historical Study*, by Frank Hewitt Cowles. Ithaca, N. Y., *Cornell University*, 1917.

Fay (E. W.) *The Stratulax Scenes in Plautus' Truculentus.* Reprint of University of Texas Bulletin, Memorial Volume to Shakespeare and Harvey, pp. 155-176.

— *Syntax and Etymology of the Impersonals of Emotion.* Classical Quarterly, April, 1917.

Forsythe (John Evans) and Gummere (Richard Mott). *Junior Latin. Book One. The Declension of Nouns, Adjectives and Pronouns. Roman Ideas.* Philadelphia, *Christopher Sower Co.*, 1917. Square 12°, 135 pp.

Hall (J. Leslie). *English Usage.* Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, [1917].

Holy Scriptures. A New Translation with the aid of previous versions and with constant consultation of Jewish authorities. Philadelphia, *The Jewish Publication Society of America*, 1917.

Husik (Isaac). *A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy.* New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1916. 1 + 462 pp. \$3.00.

Jackson (William Walrond). *Ingram Bywater: The Memoir of an Oxford Scholar, 1840-1914.* Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1917. Price \$3.

Lacey (Raymond Henry). *The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian: Their Careers, with some Notes on Hadrian's Reforms.* Princeton dissertation. Princeton, *Princeton University Press*, 1917.

Legrand (Philippe E.) *The New Greek Comedy.* Translated by James Loeb, A. B. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1917. \$4.50.

Lucani (M. Annaei) *De Bello Civili Liber VIII.* Edited by J. P. Postgate. Cambridge, *Cambridge University Press*, 1917; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons.* (Pitt Press Series.) cxii + 146 pp. and map.

Lucretius. *Of the Nature of Things. A Metrical Translation* by William Ellery Leonard. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1916.

Margolis (Max L.) *The Story of Bible Translations.* Philadelphia, *The Jewish Publication Society of America*, 1917.

Michelson (Truman). *Remarks on American Indian Languages. A Study in Method.* Reprinted from the Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, Vol. VII, No. 8, April 19, 1917.

Mierow (Charles C.) *A Description of MS Garrett Deposit 1450, Princeton University Library, together with a Collation of the First Work contained in it, The De Arca Noe De Sancto Victore.* Reprinted from *Transactions of the American Library Institute* 1917. Princeton, N. J., 1917.

— *St. Severinus and the Closing Years of the Province of Noricum.* (Colorado College Publication, Language Series, Vol. II, No. 33. Pp. 299-318.) Colorado Springs, 1917.

Modern Language Notes. Vol. XXXII. Number 5. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, May, 1917.

Mortality Statistics 1915. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sam L. Rogers, Director. Sixteenth Annual Report. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1917.

Oldfather (W. A.) Roman Comedy. *Classical Weekly*, VII (1914), pp. 217-222.

— The Fine Arts and the Classics. *Classical Weekly*, VIII (1914), pp. 65-67.

— Studies in the History and Topography of Locris. Reprinted from the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, XX (1916), 32-61, 154-172.

— Addenda on Larymna and Cyrtone. Reprinted from the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, XX (1916), 316-349.

Petersen (Walter). Latin Diminution of Adjectives. (Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vols. XI-XII, Nos. 4-1, October-January, 1916-1917.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXIV, Núms. 1. 2. 3. Enero-Junio de 1917. Habana, *Imprenta "El Siglo XX"*.

Roberts (W. Rhys). Greek Civilization as a Study for the People. (From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. VII.) London, *Oxford University Press*, 1917. One shilling net.

Robinson (D. M.) A Vase Fragment in the Style of Oltos. *A. J. A.*, Second Series, Vol. XXI (1917), No. 2.

Robinson (Edna Moore). Tennyson's Use of the Bible. IX + 110 pp. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*; Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1917. cl. \$1.50.

Sanders (Henry A.) Old Testament Manuscripts. Freer Collection, Part II. The Washington Manuscript of the Psalms. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. VIII, 2. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1917..

Science and Learning in France. With a Survey of Opportunities for American Students in French Universities. An Appreciation by American Scholars. The Society for American Fellowships in French Universities, 1917.

Shields (Emily Ledyard). The Cults of Lesbos. (Johns Hopkins dissertation.) xviii + 100 pp. Menasha, Wisconsin, *George Banta Publishing Co.*, 1917.

Society of Biblical Archaeology (The). Proceedings of. Vol. XXXIX, Part 3. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1917.

Spring (Evelyn). A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy. (Reprinted from the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXVIII, 1917, pp. 135-224.

Studies in Philology. University of North Carolina. Vol. XIV, No. 2, April, 1917. Elizabethan Studies. Second Series. Chapel Hill, N. C.

Tertullianus (Q. Septimi Florentis) Apologeticus. Annotated with an Introduction by John E. B. Mayor. With a translation by Alex. Souter. Cambridge, *At the University Press*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1917. \$3.75.

Tuttle (Edwin H.) Notes on Romanic Speech-History. Reprinted from *The Modern Language Review*, XI (1916), pp. 450-457, and XII (1917), pp. 192-199. Cambridge, *At the University Press*.

— Locus in Gallo-Roman. Reprinted for private circulation from *Modern Philology*, XIV, No. 11, March, 1917, pp. 163-168.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, 4

WHOLE NO. 152.

I.—THE ST. GALL GLOSSARY.

This glossary is known to American Latinists from Prof. Minton Warren's monograph (Cambridge, 1885). I propose in this paper a discussion of its relation to Festus' epitome of Verrius Flaccus.

Goetz in his *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* has provided an apparatus criticus for editing Latin glosses. We find there the various forms which a gloss has taken in different glossaries, e. g. *Falarica* (1) *genus hastae grandis*, (2) *genus arte (arcae) grandis*, (3) *genus argente (-ti) grandis*, (4) *genus artis grandis*; *Agea* (1) *uta (leg. via) gyrum navis*, (2) *recurrens unda*, (3) *via navis in aqua dextra laevaque*. But how are we to determine the 'archetype' form, the form which it had in the original source? Through the shifting sand of glossary tradition how can we reach the bed-rock? A paper in the (English) *Journal of Philology* reveals three original sources: (1) the true *Placidus Glossary* (*Plac.*), (2) the so-called 'shorter glosses of Placidus', which I propose to call the *pseudo-Placidus Glossary* (*ps.-Plac.*), (3) what I call the *Abolita Glossary* (*Abol.*), the glosses enclosed in square brackets in *Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV* pp. 4-198, beginning with the item (4, 5) *Abolita: abstersa vel deleta*. The history of the first two is sketched in this style (*Journ. Phil. of 1917*):

Some pupil of Placidus arranged in alphabetical order (by A-, not AB-) the notes he had taken of his master's lectures and published them as a glossary (*Plac.*). Some owner of this glossary incorporated with it a collection of the brief marginal

notes entered in texts of the early Republican writers. This collection (ps.-Plac.) presented each word in the actual form which it bore in the text and arranged the words in the order of their occurrence in the text. The person who transferred its glosses to his MS of the Placidus Glossary made a pause after finishing the P-glosses (perhaps because he found no Q-section in Plac.) and never resumed his task. This MS of his was the one and only transmitter of the ps.-Plac. glossary to us.

The history of the third, the Abolita Glossary, I take to be this. In the seventh century (towards its close?) some monastery-teacher in Spain took from the shelves of the monastery-library a copy of Festus and decided to make a glossary out of it. He found however that it did not provide enough of suitable material and, after he had filled a number of pages with excerpts from its lemmas, looked about for a means of completing his design. He ordered some (young and ignorant) monk to copy out the brief marginal notes in the library text of Virgil, of Terence, of Apuleius and of at least two (unknown) Christian authors, and to set them (each in the order of its occurrence) in the glossary. The Virgil volume provided a mass of marginalia, especially in the opening books of the Aeneid. It was a volume akin to that from whose marginalia was compiled the Virgil Glossary printed in vol. IV (pp. 427 sqq.) of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. The common source of both had, for example, at Aen. 6, 395 the marginal note, *Tartareum custodem: canem tricipitem* (with the gloss *Cerberum*) ; and this has produced the strange item, *Tartareum custodem: canem tricerberum tricipitem*. The word 'chorus' in Geo. 4, 460 had, I think, the marginal note (which betrays a monastery-teacher's hand), *Chorus: multitudo, Corus: modii X* (see *Thes. Gloss. s. vv. chorus, corus, modix*). The Apuleius volume (possibly including some works now lost) did not provide so many marginalia as the Terence ; but any scraps from a 7th century Spanish MS of Apuleius (or of Terence) are welcome.¹ For example, 'concupulassent' (not 'compilassent')

¹ Gnueg's dissertation 'de glossis Terentianis codicis Vaticani 3321' I have not been able to see and cannot say whether he has recognized 'rebamini' (not 'verebamini') as the reading in *Phorm. 901*. The Virgil glosses of Abolita are being investigated. Will anyone who has leisure and inclination for an investigation of the *Apuleius* glosses

seems to have been its reading in Met. 9, 2; 'satagentes' (not 'satis agentes') in Met. 8, 17. All glossaries drift into alphabetical arrangement sooner or later: this one would be likely to assume an AB-order very soon, for that order would be suggested by the Festus glosses on its opening pages. It was at some time or other incorporated with a different collection, the Abstrusa Glossary, and took from its new neighbour a movement towards an ABC-order. In this composite form it has come down to us; and although its items are in our two good MSS kept distinct from those of Abstrusa (*Abstr.*), the alphabetical re-arrangement has so broken up the original batches of Virgil glosses, Terence glosses, etc., that we are often at a loss to detect them. But not always. For example, in the SU-section (C. G. L. IV, p. 180) we find (no. 42) Subservias: subeas, quiescas (from Andr. 735) followed by (no. 43) Susurrat: murmurat (from Andr. 779), then by (no. 44) <Substat>: subsistit, sufficit, praevalet (from Andr. 914). Now a 10th century glossary offers (C. G. L. V 514, 23) Subserviat: subeat, quiescat. We recognize the item to be derived from the Abolita gloss, the ultimate source, the gloss taken directly from Terence marginalia (cf. IV 69, 38 and V 454, 24; IV 79, 19-20 and V 458, 16-17).

The Festus glosses of Abolita are treated in an article not yet published. In this one I will discuss a glossary derived in part from the composite Abstrusa-Abolita and able to throw light on the correct form of the Abolita Festus glosses and, I think, to add to their number.

An apograph will be found in C. G. L. IV, pp. 201 sqq. of the St. Gall MS (no. 912), written at St. Gall in rude uncials of apparently the 8th century. So the MS may be of about the same age as our oldest MS of Abolita (Vat. lat. 3321). It is a mere pocket-copy, hastily prepared, not by any means a 'codex archetypus ad cuius exemplaria sunt reliqui corrigendi' (to quote the famous entry in the Bamberg Cassiodorus), and we must fix our minds on the lost exemplar from which it was transcribed, on the work of the compiler rather than of the transcriber. The glossary (*Sangall.*) consists in part, perhaps the

kindly write to me. No special knowledge is required for this small piece of work but merely (since there is no suitable lexicon) some hunting for words through Apuleius' pages.

larger part, of Abstrusa and Abolita glosses, not mechanically transcribed by an ignorant monk (as were the Virgil and Terence marginalia culled for Abolita) but selected by an intelligent compiler, who did not hesitate to make a single patchwork item out of two or more items of his exemplar (e. g. 260, 42 combines two Abolita glosses with two Abstrusa; 253, 10 an Abol. and an Abstr.) and even to re-cast the form of a gloss-word or its interpretation when he thought proper (cf. 296, 12 with 193, 25). Its evidence for the correct form of a Festus gloss of Abolita must therefore be used with caution. To illustrate from a Virgil gloss: the note at Aen. I, 497 in the margin of that annotated edition (or MS) of Virgil which was the ultimate source of the Virgil Glossary as well as of the Abolita Virgil glosses was (465, 3) *Stipante caterva: cingente multitudine*. In Abolita the interpretation lost its initial letter, and in the Vatican MS we find an attempt to improve the reading (176, 31 *ingente multitudine collecti*). The compiler of our glossary found the same faulty form of the interpretation in his Abstr.-Abol. MS. He tried conjectural emendation, (286, 38) *Stipante caterva: comprimente multitudine*. But since Festus (p. 182 of the small Teubner text) treats *Nictare* (and *Nictari*), our glossary's *Nectari* (261, 37) is probably truer to the archetype than the *Necturi* (123, 39) of the Vatican (*Lat.*) and Monte Cassino (*Cass.*) MSS of the composite Abstr.-Abol. glossary. Perhaps the corruption of the rest of the gloss is due to that characteristic 'causa erroris' in Glossary MSS, capricious suspension (see my *Notae Latinae*, p. 416). In the archetype, I fancy, stood *Nectari oculorum frequenti aper(tione)*. This has become in Vat. and Cass. *Necturi oculorum frequentia*; in Sangall. *Nectari oculorum frequentia aperiri*. Where our MS is the most helpful is in the cases where Cass. offers (in the Abolita portions) a gloss omitted by Vat. These present great difficulty, for while Cass. is full of interpolations on the one hand, Vat. on the other undoubtedly omits many glosses (e. g. Abstrusa glosses), partly long glosses (awkward for an uncial glossary) by design, partly short glosses by inadvertence.

Our MS, by its re-casting, (290, 30) *Trabea: vestis senatoria purpurea*, claims for Abolita a long gloss of Cass. which is omitted by Vat., (187, 17b) *Trabea: vestis senatoria ex purpura et coco, unde trabeatus dicitur qui ea utitur*). This long

Festus (?) gloss of Abolita was shortened by the compiler; but another long Festus gloss of Abolita (186, 43) was shortened by the scribe of the pocket-copy, (290, 27) *Trasenna: tegula <a>perta qua lumen venit* (the other MSS admit the full form). Short glosses would easily be overlooked in any rearrangement of a large number into stricter alphabetical order (cf. *Class. Quart.* 6, 92 *n.*) and, as we have seen, Vat. exhibits Abolita in transition from the AB- to the ABC- stage. Our glossary too bears signs of departure from its original arrangement; for 214, 3 (*Calamaularius: ipse qui de canna canit*) must have stood immediately after 213, 43 (*Calamaula: canna de qua canitur*), and 250, 16 (*Inlectant: quod supra*) after 249, 52 (*Inlicitant: inlicita persuadent*), as in *Abstrusa* (94, 51-52). That common error of glossary-transcription, the fusion of two lemmas, shews us that a co- and a ca-word were originally neighbours, (220, 51) *Compernes* and *Calcitrones*, whereas an AB- or ABC-order now prevails throughout the work. Evidently no inference from its present order is safe.

The nature of the compilation, in particular the treatment of the *Abstr.-Abol.* glosses, may be illustrated from two short portions:

I. (the vo-words, p. 296, nos. 41 sqq.)—(no. 41) *Volumen: liber, a volvendo dict.*; (no. 42) *Voluntas: mens*; (no. 43) *Vorat: sorbet* (cf. *Abstr.* 195, 38) *Vorax: sorbens*; 195, 40 *Vorat: gluttit*; (no. 44) *Volvit pectore cogitat* (? cf. *Abol.* 195, 34) *Volvere: cogitare*; (no. 45) *Volubilitas mentis: varietas m(entis)*; (no. 46) *Voluptas: concupiscentia*; (no. 47) *Volutabria: loca in quibus se porci voluntantur* (? cf. *Abol.* 195, 39) *Volutabria: lacunae in quibus iumenta voluntantur*; (no. 48) *Volucres: veloci* (cf. *Abol.* 195, 36-37) *Volucres: aves, Volucrem: velociter fluentem, a Virgil gloss on Aen. 1, 317*; (no. 49) *Vola: manus cava in medio, unde involare dicimus* (? cf. *Abol.* 195, 28) *Vola: pars manus cava in medio*; (no. 50) *Vorago: obsorptio et fossa profunda et terrae hiatus* (cf. *Abol.* 195, 49-50) *Vorago: obsorptio, Voraginem: barathrum*; (no. 51) *Vosmet: vos ipsos* (= *Abstr.* 195, 42); (no. 52) *Vociferatur: clamat*; (no. 53) *Vovet: promittit* (= *Abstr.* 195, 44); (no. 54) *Voetema (leg. Βοήθημα): adiutoria* (cf. *Abstr.* 195, 19) *Voetema: adiutoria; graecum est*; (297, 1) *Voti compos: memor*. EXPL(icit) DE VO (? cf. *Abol.* 195,

46 Voti compos: consentaneus votis [compositus voti]). The last item (which concludes the vo-glosses) shews us that the exemplar was divided into sections, with headings like INC(ipit) DE VO (as in Vat.) and endings like EXPL(icit) DE VO.

II. (p. 278, col. i)—(no. 1) Ramen<tum>: pulvis qui raditur de aliqua specie (=Abstr. 159, 47; 'species' late Lat. for thing, sort of thing); (no. 2) Randus (*leg. Rapidus*): velox, celer (? cf. Abstr. 159, 50 *Rapidus*: *velox*); (no. 3) Radicitus: funditus; (no. 4) Ramnensis tribus a Romulo constituta; (no. 5) Raca (i. e. *ῥάκα*, Mat. 5, 22): inanis, vacuus, vanus; (no. 6) Rastri: ligones (=Abstr. 160, 6); (no. 7) Rava: rauca vel clausa ('congested', of the throat); (no. 8) Rebitere: redire; (no. 9) Radiat: splendet; (no. 10) Redimitus: coronatus, ornatus (cf. Abstr. 161, 17-18 *Redimitus*: coronatus, *Redimiculum*: ornamentum); (no. 11) Reticuit: tacuit (a doublet of 279, 40); (no. 12) Redimicula: retinacula (=Abol. 163, 6); (no. 13) Redivivum: a vetustate renovatum (=Abol. 160, 46); (no. 14) Redarguit: convincit, de reatu arguit (=Abstr. 161, 13); (no. 15) Redhibet: impensam sibi gratiam reddit (=Abstr. 161, 15); (no. 16) Redigitur: revocatur (=Abstr. 161, 26); (no. 17) Redactus: perductus; (no. 18) Redolet: bene olet (=Abol. 162, 52); (no. 19) Redhibitionem: retributionem; (no. 20) Reductum: retro ductum; (no. 21) Rediviva: renascentia (=Abstr. 161, 28); (no. 22) Redamat: amantem [se] mutuo dilig(it) (=Abstr. 161, 14); (no. 23) Reduvias: reliquias; (no. 24) Reduces: salvos, incolumes, reversos (=Abstr. 161, 22); (no. 25) Redintegrat: integrum restituit; (no. 26) Recludit: aperit et recludit (cf. Abstr. 160, 34 *Recludit*: aperit); (no. 27) Recenset: recitat, recognoscit (cf. Abstr. 160, 33 *Recenset*: numerat à regit vel recognoscit); (no. 28) Recubat: accumbit.

In these two samples the glosses taken from the composite Abstr.-Abol. glossary are decidedly more numerous than those taken from elsewhere. On some pages however the ratio is less unequal. The preponderance of the Abstr. over the Abol. items is a puzzling feature. It may be explained partly by the precedence of the Abstr. portions in the composite glossary; but I suspect also that the Virgil and Terence glosses were

marked (in the margin?) DE VIRG., DE TER., and that the compiler made a practice of ignoring them (or most of them) because his monastery-library already possessed special Virgil and Terence Glossaries (possibly written in the very volume in which the compilation was entered). Among those 'taken from elsewhere' (a convenient phrase which does not commit one to any theory that only one other composite glossary was used by the compiler, or that several simple glossaries were employed, or that part of his compilation was culled by himself from marginalia in the MSS of his monastery-library) we easily detect a Greek series: e. g. on p. 216 (no. 13) Casu: titixi (*leg. τῇ τύχῃ*); (no. 23) Amicum: ton filon (cf. no. 25). The word *μητρούα* has puzzled the scribe, (262, 46) Noverca: matrea, id est matrinia. Since 'a Cadmean victory' is rather a Greek than a Latin phrase, we may suppose that the source of 215, 4 had *Καδμεία νίκη*: non bona. We may doubt whether the interpretation in 293, 39 (Turibulum: thymiaterium) would be written in Greek or in Latin form; or the gloss-word in the curious quintette, (211, 25) Brephotrophium: locus venerabilis in quo infantes aluntur, (262, 13) Nosocomium: locum venerabilem in quo infirmi homines curantur, (241, 35) Gerontocomium: locum venerabilem in quo, etc., (273, 43) Ptochotrophium: locus in quo, etc., (298, 21) Xenodochium: locum venerabilem in quo peregrini suscipi(untur). (The last appears in Cass., an interpolation apparently.) We need not hesitate to affirm that at least one source (immediate or ultimate) was a glossary 'utriusque linguae' in use at some monastery where Greek was spoken or studied, i. e. either in South Italy (such as Vivarium) or an Irish cloister (such as Bobbio near Milan¹). So while the one source of our glossary, the Abstr.-Abol. compound, came from Spain to Italy, this other source is Italian and not Spanish. (Isidore knew no Greek.) The MS most closely connected with the St. Gall codex was written at Bobbio in the beginning of the 9th century (*c* in Goetz' apparatus criticus). The two leading MSS of the Asbestos Glossary, which seems from Goetz' account to be practically identical with ours, were written

¹ There is a gloss (255, 15) Liguria: provincia Italiae *in qua est Mediolanum*. It may have come from a marginal note in a text. So may the gloss (210, 38) Baltha: audax Gothice (e. g. on a proper name ending in -baldus).

(at the beginning of the 10th century) at Monte Cassino (*a* of Goetz) and, I think, in Central Italy (*b* of Goetz). A famous Latin-Greek glossary (wrongly ascribed to Philoxenus) is printed in vol. II of the *Corpus Glossariorum*, pp. 3-212. From Dammann's account (in *Commentationes Philologae Ienenses*, 5, 1 sqq.), *De Festo pseudo-Philoxeni auctore*, we see that it provides 'archetype' glosses culled from *Festus*, etc. If we turn over its pages we realize what an enormous variety of pure Latin glosses might have come from such a source, and how the same bilingual item may have taken different forms from different compilers. On the first page of the bilingual glossary (*Philox.*) we find (no. 41) *Abiugassere*: ἀποζεῦξαι. Our glossary offers (201, 16) *Abiugassere*: *disiungere*; another glossary, the AA Glossary, seems to have had (437, 4) *Abiugassere abiugare dissolvere*. Both the Sangall. and the AA interpretation may be different translations of the same Greek word. But while in the case of a rare early Republican form like 'abiugassere' we have a definite clue pointing to the actual use of Philox. by our compiler, we have none quite so clear in the case of other items on the same page: (no. 10) *Abavus*: προπάππου πατήρ (cf. 201, 2 *Abavus*: *tritavi pater*); (no. 13) *Abdicat*: ἀποκρύσσει (cf. 202, 4 *Abdicat*: *a se alienat*); (no. 14) *Abdidit*: ἀπέκρυψεν, ἀπέκλεισεν (cf. 202, 6 *Abdidit*: *occultavit*); (no. 27) *Abgrego*: ἀπαγελάζω, διαχωρίζω (cf. 202, 7 *Abgrego*: *separo, segrego*. If the original order was 'segrego, separo', the identification can dispense with doubt); (no. 31) *Abhorret*: ἀποφίσσει, ἀπωδόν ἔστι (cf. 201, 33 *Abhorret*: *dissonat, discrepat*); (no. 33) *Abigeus*: ἀπελάτης (? cf. 201, 14 *Abigeus*: *qui tollit rem alienam*); (no. 34) *Abigit*: ἀπελαίνει, ἐκτιγρώσκει (cf. 201, 13 *Abigit*: *proicit, minat*. This is late Latin *minare*, French *mener*); (no. 37) *Abit*: ἀπέρχεται (cf. 201, 8 *Abit*: *discedit*). And yet we must allow the great probability that all these glosses are (like *Abiugassere*) derived from Philox., unless it can be shewn, in this or that case, that some other source is more likely: e. g. the first item in our glossary, *Abba*: *pater*, may come from the gloss which stands in Cass. at the beginning of *Abstr.-Abol.*—*Abba Syre* (-rum), *Graece pater* etc.—rather than from the 26th item of Philox., *Abba*: τέττα.

With two so prolific sources, *Abstr.-Abol.* and *Philox.*, we might hope to account for every item of our glossary. But such

a gloss as 292, 28 (Trieris: *navis magna, de qua in Esaia 'non transibit per eam <trieris magna> '*) comes, with its neighbour (292, 29 Trieres: *naves magnae quas Graeci durcones vocant*), from Isidore (Etym. 19, 1, 10) Trieris, *navis magna quam Graeci durconem vocant; de qua in Esaia (33, 21) 'non transibit per eam trieris magna'*. Similarly no. 27 on the same page comes from Etym. 14, 6, 32 Sicilia . . . prius autem Trinacria dicta, etc. Now Isidore often reproduces the language of his authorities, e. g. Servius. Since we have established that Isidore was actually a source of our glossary, we must (on the principle 'Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem') refuse to ascribe to Servius any item which can be ascribed to Isidore; at least until Servius too has been proved to be a source.

Another thread easily detected is a feature of most medieval glossaries, items like (240, 40-41) Gabrihel: *fortitudo Dei, Galilaei: volubiles*. These etymologies of Biblical names (culled from Jerome or Eucherius or directly from Isidore, etc.) often filled blank pages at the end of a glossary and would be incorporated with it at the next transcription. But a detailed analysis of the contents of Sangall. lies outside the scope of this article, which professes to be an investigation of the *Festus* glosses in this glossary.

Since *Festus*' work is fully preserved for the letters N, Q and (we may add) R, S, we had better begin our search for possible *Festus* glosses in these parts of Sangall. Of the borrowings from *Abolita* only those omitted in *Vat.*, *Cass.* (or in *Vat.* alone) need be mentioned. An item found in a large number of glossaries, (261, 42) *Nictit canis cum acute gannit*, looks like an extract from *Fest.* 184 *Nictit canis in odorandis ferarum vestigiis; ut Ennius . . . 'nictit ululatque ibi acute'*; unde ipsa *gannitio*. The 'acute' is provided by the *Ennius* quotation. If this *Festus* gloss came from *Abolita*, it has been omitted by both *Vat.* and *Cass.* *Paulus* (s. v. *Callim.* 41, 6) mentions the Early Latin use of 'nis pro nobis'. Our glossary offers (261, 51) *Nis: nobis*. A weaker claimant to a *Festus* connexion is (261, 30) *Neque: non* (cf. *Fest.* 158 *Nec coniunctionem . . . positam esse ab antiquis pro non*). *Nocticula: luna* (262, 21) may come from *Philox.* 134, 17 (*Nocticula: Ἐκάτη νυκτοφαίνουσα*) where the explanation *νυκτοφαίνουσα* demands *Noctiluca*.

This is however not found in the N-section nor in any other extant part of Festus and may be one of the many Horace glosses of Philox. Nusciosus (262, 39) comes from Abstrusa, and there is no evidence that Abstrusa contains Festus glosses. Nepa: *vipera* (261, 11) does not suit Festus' definition (162 *cancer vel, ut quidam, scorpios*).

In the Q-section no item need be mentioned. In the R-section there is no counterpart in Abolita of (278, 4) *Ramnensis tribus a Romulo constituta*. Its form does not suggest Philox. as the source. On the same page stands (no. 7) *Rava: rauca vel clausa*. It would suggest Festus more strongly if the gloss were *Rava vox* (cf. Fest. 354 *Ravam vocem*). After it comes an Early Latin gloss (no. 8) *Rebitere: redire* (quite in the form of Philox. items), but this verb (simple and compound) is a stock topic of glossaries. In the R-section of Festus there is no mention of 'rebitere'.

Of the R-items of ps.-Plac. only one, I think, has survived, *Rediviam: redivivam* (s. v. *Excetra* 21, 11), but the writer of the preface in the Salmasian Anthology uses an Inf. *reduviare*. It would be rash to connect this with our gloss (278, 23) *Reduvias: reliquias*. We should have to suppose that he wrote 'me . . . eandem normam *reduviare compellit*' and got his imaginary *reduviare* 'relinquere' through mistaking *reduvias* for 2 Sing. of a verb of the First Conjugation. On p. 280 we find (no. 35) *Rorarius: miles qui primo in bello pugnam committit*. This suits Paulus' extract (323 *Rorarios milites vocabant, etc.*) from Festus' missing lemma, and the use of the Nom. Sing., the case exhibited in both of Lucilius' lines (290 and 393), favours this claimant. Was it an Abolita gloss omitted by Vat. and Cass.? There is an absurd combination (280, 45) *Ruma: mamma, al(iter) pugna*. We need not attribute it to the compiler. He may quite well have kept separate, as other glossaries do, *Ruma* and *Runa*. He may too have added to the latter, as they do, *Runata*; for *Runata* would easily drop out after *Runa*. The problem has been much discussed and remains unsolved, but the combined evidence of the three witnesses (the St. Gall Glossary, the AA Glossary, the glossary of Vat. lat. 1471) certainly points to the existence of two items drawn from that lost lemma of Festus which Paulus excerpted thus: (317) *Runa genus teli significat*; Ennius 'ru-

nata recedit', id est proeliata. Of the discrepancy in Paulus' excerpt between 'genus teli' and 'proeliata' we find no hint in the glossaries (Runa: pugna), unless the interpretation of Runata in the AA Glossary (suspicata) is a corruption of *spiculata* 'having hurled spicula' (like *iaculata* 'having hurled iacula'). Were these two (Runa and Runata) Abolita glosses omitted by Vat. and Cass.? Did the compiler of Abolita find in his (Spanish) MS of Festus genus belli (as Landgraf suggested)? Or was his actual extract merely Runata: proeliata; a runa? Certainly the AA Glossary used a good MS of Abstr.-Abol. and got from it several Festus glosses omitted by Vat. and Cass. To complete the discussion it must be mentioned that the Glossae Nominum, which draw mostly from Philox., offer (591, 43) Runa: stipula (*leg* spiculum?, spicula?).

After Marx' explanation of Lucilius' gibe we cannot connect 282, 44 (Status: statura) with Lucil. 794. And 283, 45 (Septimontium: dies festus urbis Romae, quia super septem montes sedet) is not identical with Fest. 458; nor yet 289, 56 (Suovetaurilia) with Fest. 372. The true form of 284, 41 may be Sicile: sutor<i>um. There is an Abolita gloss, (180, 46) Suffrancinus: sub brachio carricatus (French chargé), from a Terence batch already mentioned. (The next gloss, from Andr. 181, should be Oscitantes: dormientes.) But our glossary (288, 12) seems to have the actual case found in Terence's line (Andr. 770) Subfascinatam: succinctu (-tam?) armatam. That points rather to a source like Philox., as does the variety in the interpretation (from a Greek word?) in the Munich fragment (subalatus). The scribal error of Haplography might be made responsible for (288, 33) Sucerda: stercus ovile (cf. Fest. 390 Sucerdae, stercus suillum, etc.). There is no Abolita gloss, but the form would suit a source like Philox. The variant readings in Plautus Most. 765 lend interest to the items of Abstrusa 177, 12 (Sub divo: in rure, sub patenti caelo) and our glossary (287, 51) Sub sudo: sub caelo. The second hand in a 10th century MS (C. G. L. V 514, 5) combines the pair, Sub <s>udo: sub caelo, sub divo. We have a faint suggestion of Festus in 283, 28 Scirpus: iuncus, unde calamauci fiunt (cf. Fest. 444 Scirpus est id quod in palustribus locis nascitur, leve et procerum, unde tegetes fiunt, etc.); and Festus often discusses proper names like (282, 32) Scaurus: cuius calx

extrinsecus eminet et pedes introrsus incurvi sunt. Isidore (Etym. 12, 3, 2) may be the source of 282, 8 *Saur<ic>es* (*Saurex?*): *sorices* (*sorex?*). We may notice also (281, 32) *Salentinus* (-nos?): *Calabrienses* (-sis?), and (281, 47) *Sarissa*: *genus teli Macedonici* (? cf. *Fest.* 440 and 422).

For the other letters between M and U the loss of about one half of *Festus* makes us grope in the dark more than ever. Noteworthy are (258, 11) *Messala*: *agricola, messor*, (258, 8-9) *Mediastinus*: *balneator*; *nam prius mediastinus dictus, quasi in media uestione positus*. And there are two suggestions of *Festus*: (257, 12) *Macilentus*: *macer*, (258, 14) *Mergi* (-ae): *fustes quibus messes colliguntur* (cf. *Paul.* 111). But (258, 10) *Me[ta]castor* is hardly *Me ita Castor*. Rather the scribe first wrote *ta* for *ca* and left his mistake uncorrected. Much has been made of the supposed Early Latin gloss (243, 27) *Helidores*: *hortulani*. And yet it is a mere doublet of what we find in the O-section (264, 31) *Oletores*: *hortulani*. Both are rude St. Gall transcriptions of the same *Abstrusa* gloss (132, 10) *Olitores*: *hortulani*. *Festus* is suggested by (265, 29) *Opiter*: *natus avo patre non vivo, post patris mortem natus* (cf. *Paul.* 201 *Opiter est cuius pater avo vivo mortuus est, ducto vocabulo aut quod obitu patris genitus sit aut quod avum ob patrem habeat, id est pro patre*). Not so strongly by its neighbour (265, 30) *Opiparum*: *beatum, opulentum* (? cf. *Paul.* 207 *Opiparum, magnarum opum apparatum*), and by (263, 57) *Obstipum*: *obliquum, inaequale[m]* (the *Lucretius* line in *Fest.* 210 might explain ' *inaequale* '); similarly by the last half of 265, 7 (*Oppidanus*) *apud antiquos oppida dicta sunt quod opem darent* (cf. *Fest.* 222, 5).

In the P-section the gloss *Paludamenta* has been broken into two parts (266, 43 + 267, 6) *Paludamenta*: *ornamenta militum; unde hi qui in provinciam proficiscunt paludati vocantur*. A disease mentioned by *Paulus* (247 *Patagus, morbi genus*) is subject of a gloss (268, 6) *Patago*: *genus morbi*. The often quoted 267, 30 (*Pancre*: *rapina*) is an *Abstrusa* gloss (137, 9). Notice (272, 46) *Piacularis hostia*: *quae offe(rtur) pro peccato*. The (apparently) *Festus* gloss 272, 30 (*Pipat*: *conviciatur, queritur ut passer*) suggests that in *Abolita* the item, (143, 16) *Pipatio*: *clamor pipantis* (*putantis* MSS), was preceded by this item, which has dropped out in *Vat.* and *Cass.*

The second half of 272, 34, Pyxides: *vasa modica argentea vel lignea, quas vulgus 'buxides' dicunt* (French boite), may belong to the full version of Abstrusa, 144, 6 (whence it passed to C. G. L. V 93, 7), unless it comes from Isidore (Etym. 20, 7, 3 Pyxides, *vascula unguentaria ex buxo facta; nam quod nos buxum Graeci pyxum vocant*), just as the second half of 296, 41 Vola (mentioned above) may come from Etym. 17, 7, 67.

Isidore (Etym. 19, 2, 5) seems the source of the T-gloss (290, 24) Transtra: *tabulae in nave ubi remiges sedent*. But the preceding item, (290, 23) Trabica; *carina tuba (?)*, suggests the Festus lemma from which Paulus took (504) Trabica, *navis; quod sit trabibus confixa; Pacuvius 'labitur trabica in alveos'*. And the addition of one letter would make 290, 17 (Taura: 'sterilis') identical with Fest. 480 (Tauras vaccas steriles appellari, etc.). The Abolita glosses (290, 27) Transenna, (290, 30) Trabea have been already mentioned. The concluding portion (not mentioned) of the second in Cass. (187, 17a) *Dicta autem trabea quod in maiori gloria hominem tra[ns]beat, hoc est in posterum ampliori dignitate et honore beatum faci[a]t* can, of course, be referred to Isidore (Etym. 19, 24, 8) *Trabea autem dicta quod in maiori gloria hominem tra[ns]bearet* (v. l. *transveheret*), *hoc est ultra et in posterum ampliori dignitate honoris beatum faceret*. Still Isidore may have taken this absurd etymology from Festus and have kept Festus' own words (as he has done, I think, in Etym. 11, 1, 62 *Ola summi humeri pars posterior*. Cf. C. G. L. IV, p. xviii). Romance students will be interested in a gloss in this section (291, 37) Testa: *vasa fictilia et caput* (French tête). The excuse for mentioning it here is that it shews 'vasa fictilia' to be a current phrase and therefore possibly a mere conjectural emendation by the compiler in a Festus gloss, Capides, in the C-section, (215, 20) Candes: *vasa fictilia*, of which the Abolita form is (28, 2) Cardens: *vasa fretiva (festiva?) Saliorum*. The substitution of *n* for *r* suits an archetype in Insular half-uncial, and Candes is the form in the 'English group' (Ampl. I, Ampl. II, etc.). Festus is strongly suggested by the neighbour of Testa, (291, 38) Tesqua: *deserta, aspera* (cf. Fest. 488); also by (291, 50) Tetini: *tenui, habui* (cf. Paul. 503 *Tetini pro tenui*) and (293, 5) T(h)omix: *restis leviter torta* (cf. Fest. 488 *Thomices Graeco nomine appellantur ex cannabi impolita*

et sparto leviter tortae restes ex quibus funes fiunt; Lucilius, etc.) ; less strongly by the neighbour of Thomix, (293, 4) Toles membra sunt circa uvam (?? cf. Fest. 490), and by (293, 29) Trossuli: equites Romani cum equis publicis (? cf. Paul. 505) ; while 294, 1 (Tugurium: hospitium modicum <a> teia?) may be merely a re-casting of the Abstrusa item (187, 19) Tugurium: cellula parva, a tegendo.

In the U-section one claimant, Vola (296, 49; cf. Paul. 511) has been already mentioned. We may add (296, 25) Vitulans: lascivus, gaudens, cum exultatione laetans (cf. Paul. 507) : (296, 10) Vinnulus: mollis (cf. Paul. 519) ; (294, 17) Valvulum (-lus?) : fabae corium (cf. Fest. 514 Valvoli fabae folliculi appellati sunt, etc.) ; (297, 51) Urvum (-us?) : quod bubulcus tenet in aratro. The last may have been in Abolita a part (or a neighbour) of 196, 3 Urvus: circuitus civitatis. And both may come from Fest. 514 (Urvat Ennius in Andromeda significat circumdat, ab eo sulco qui fit in urbe condenda urvo aratri, quae fit forma simillima uncini curvatione buris et dentis, cui praefigitur vormer), unless the first is taken from Isidore (Etym. 15, 2, 3 Urbs . . . ab urbo, parte aratri). Isidore borrows from Servius (ad Aen. 1, 12). Finally (296, 40) Vitiligat (-gant): vituperat (-rant). Loewe makes it Vitilitigat (-gant), a Cato gloss.

For A-L Festus is not in evidence. In the A-section of our glossary we find: (202, 11) Avillus (Abellum MSS; cf. the AA Glossary 442, 3 and 10) : agnus recens natus (cf. Paul. 13 Avillus: agnus recentis partus) : (202, 16) Abiugassere: disiungere ('unyoke'), already mentioned; (202, 35) Apluda (Abunda MSS) : panici et millei folliculi (cf. Paul. 10) ; (202, 20) Aptra: folia vitea (= Philox. 18, 34 Aptra: *ἀμπελόφυλλα, ὡς Τετίνιος*) ; (202, 39) Acieris (Acierlis MSS) : securis quam flamines seu pontifices habebant (cf. Paul. 9; possibly taken directly from Philox. 13, 9 A.: *ἀξίνη ἱεροφάντου, ὡς Πλαύτος*, so that we need not ascribe 'flam.', 'pont.' to Festus) ; (204, 21) Aestimiae (Aefumiae in the archetype?) : aestimationes (Paul. 24 Aestimias, aestimationes) ; (205, 28) Allux: pollex in pede (from Philox. 68, 12 Hallus: *ποδὸς μέγας δάκτυλος*. Cf. Paul. 91 Hallus: pollex pedis, etc. The Latin Thesaurus omits 'pedis') ; (206, 6) Alebre: pulchrum, bene educatum (cf. Philox. 14, 35 A.: *εὐτροφος*. A clearer trace of Festus is in the

First Ampronian Glossary, Alebre: *alimentum*, while the Second Ampronian Glossary seems to blend Fest. and Philox. in its Alebre: *quod bene a quibus alitur*); (206, 9) Altiboans: in *alto ex alto sonans* (of the Philox. type); (206, 8 and 10) Al[ci]tellus: *alte evocatus* (*leg. educatus*), Altellus: <in> *terra nutritus* (cf. Paul. 6 Altellus Romulus dicebatur quasi *altus in tellure*, etc.); (206, 28) A[n]xati: *vocati, nominati* (the error suggests Philox., although even in Paul. 7 Axare: *nominare* appears among an-items); (206, 29) A[n]xilites: *aves, volucres* (from Philox. 21, 37 A[n]xilites: *ὁρνιθες, οἰωνοι*. Cf. Paul. 3 Alites, among ax-items. The AA Glossary probably retains the Festus gloss of Abol. in its A[n]xilites: *aves, auspicium, perhaps a reduction of A[n]xillites: aves auspicium volatu facientes*); (207, 48) Ardalio: *glutto* (perhaps a Martial gloss in Philox.); (208, 11) Arferia (Arseria in the archetype): *vas vinarium cum quo vinum ad aras ferebant* (Paul. 10 jumbles up *arferial*, -lis 'aqua' and *arferia* 'vas'); (208, 13) Arcera: *plastrum* (corrects the error in Paul. 14 Arcirma genus *plaustri* est, etc.; for we have no reason to suppose that our compiler used ps.-Plac. 7, 2 Arcera: *plastrum, id est carrum*); (208, 35) Asparagus, *quia virgas habet asperas* (? cf. Paul. 18); (209, 27) Aureax: [n]eque<s> *solitarius* (= Philox. 26, 51 Aureax: *solitarius ἵτταστης*. Cf. Paul. 8 Aureax, auriga, etc.); (209, 30) Auctoratio: *venditio, nam sub auctoratione sunt gladiatores qui se vendunt*. Since 203, 1 (Accipitrem: *acceptorem*) is an Abstrusa gloss (5, 31), it does not concern us. Lucilius (1130 *exta acceptoris et unguis*) made a purist's mistake in rejecting *accipiter*, the Indo-European name for the hawk, 'the quick-flyer' (Greek *ἀκυπέρης*), an excellent name, as anyone will admit who has watched a hawk chasing a pigeon.

In the B-section we find (212, 38) <Boves lucae:> *boves Lucaniae, elephanti* (possibly from Philox. Cf. the Cyrillus Glossary's 'Ελέφας: *elephantus, bos luca, barrus*. Was the phrase mentioned in the Festus lemma from which Paulus took the lemma Barrire? Cf. the Affatim gloss, 489, 28); (213, 3) Bubinare: *inquinare sanguine muliebri menstruo* (cf. Paul. 29 Bubinare est menstruo mulierum sanguine inquinare; Lucilius, etc.). The second has been ascribed to ps.-Plac. (8, 18). But his lemma is Bubino, and Bubinare is precisely the lemma of Paulus; so this argument for a borrowing from ps.-Plac. by

our compiler lacks force. It is more likely that an Abolita gloss omitted in Vat. and Cass. has been used; or perhaps one omitted by Cass. alone, for all this part (AR-BU) of Vat. has been lost. We have no Abolita glosses in Cass. like (212, 21-2) *Boa: rubor vehemens, Boa: serpens mirae magnitudinis et tumor in crure suffuso sanguine* (cf. Paul. 27 *Bova*). Certainly a lemma of ps.-Plac., (34, 2) *Blattit: praecipue loquitur (praecupide l. Deuerling)*, tallies with our gloss (210, 52) *Blattit: perstupide (leg. praecupide?) loquitur*. But our gloss may be an Abolita gloss (omitted by Cass.) from the *Festus* lemma from which comes Paulus' excerpt (30) *Blatterare est stulte et praecupide loqui, quod a Graeco blax originem dicit, etc.*; and so may its two neighbours, (210, 51) *Blax: stultus, insipiens* (cf. Abol. 25, 65 *Blax: stultus*) and (210, 53) *Blapere (leg. Blaterare?): stupide et sine causa loqui* (cf. Abol. 26, 1 *Blaterat: stulte loquitur*). Whether the evidence of Vat. would have settled our doubts we do not know. We have no reason to ascribe to *Festus* the pair, (210, 10) *Bacerus: baro factus*, (210, 25) *Barginae: peregrinae* (from *Philox.*). The Latin *Thesaurus* should not assign the quantity *bargina* to the mnemonic verses in a school-edition of *Caper* (Gram. Lat. VII 103, 8), for these verses are probably as much 'syllabic' (with syllable-counting) as quantitative. But 211, 15 (*Buteo: aves quae in auspicio servatur*) certainly suggests the *Festus* source of Paul. 3, 10 *Alites volatu auspicia facientes istae putabantur, buteo, etc.*

In the C-section: (213, 30) *Campae: equi marini* (cf. Paul. 38 *Campas, marinos equos, etc.*); (213, 51) *Capite census: qui de captivis sub corona vel sub hasta vendebatur*; (214, 1) *Calator: minister sacrorum*; (214, 29) *Capidores (-ped-?)*, *eo quod manu capiantur* (a gloss which, according to Hagen Appendix *Serviana* p. 480, appears in the Berne *Liber Glossarum* as a *Virgil Gloss*) (cf. Paul. 42 *Capis, poculi genus, dictum a capiendo*. The other gloss *Capides* has been mentioned already); (214, 51) *Caculae: servi militum* (cf. Paul. 39 *Cacula, servus militis*. *Plautus* 'video caculam militarem'. This is a ludicrous curtailment of *Trin. 721*. *Festus*' lemma would quote the full line; also the line of *Accius* quoted by him at 132, 15 and containing *caculae*); (214, 52, a doublet of 219, 37) *Cocula: ligna arida vel vasa aerea* (not to be referred to

ps.-Plac. 14, 36 Coculis: aereis vasis ad coquendum vel assulis aridis. Cf. Paul. 34 Cocula: vasa aenea coctionibus apta; alii cocula dicunt ligna minuta quibus facile decoquantur obsonia); (215, 2) Calvitur: fallit (hardly from Philox. 96, 24 Calvitur: *λεπαρτᾶ*). Rather from the Abolita gloss 27, 53, which is one of a Festus batch, although our Abolita MSS shew 'moratur' only, not 'fallit'); (215, 22) Caperrata: contracta, rugosa (cf. Paul. 41 Caperratum, rugosum, a cornuum caprinorum similitudine dicitur. If our gloss shews the Abl., then Festus quoted the whole of Naevius com. 51, of which we know only two words 'caperrata fronte'; if the Nom., which is less likely, he may have quoted Varro Men. 134 quin mihi caperratam tuam frontem, Strobile, omittis?, or else the Comedian's line which Varro parodies or reproduces. The lost Abolita gloss may have dropped out of our MSS in proximity to 29, 34 Caperratum, a gloss from Apuleius. There is however still another possibility, that our gloss is a Nonius gloss and that the Festus gloss of Abol. is preserved in the Liber Glossarum, Caperratum: erectum, rigidum); (215, 44) Calcitrones: qui infestant calcibus (originally a neighbour of Compernes 220, 51), perhaps an Apuleius gloss of Abol. which has dropped out of Vat. (Cass. n. 1); (216, 8) Claudier: claudi (perhaps a Terence gloss of Abol., lost in our MSS); (217, 5) Cicuma (Caec- MSS): noctua (cf. Paul. 35 Cicuma avis noctua); (216, 35) Gliscit: crescit (perhaps from the third letter-section of Philox., 34, 19 Gliscit: *αὔξει*. Cf. Paul. 87 Gliscere crescere est, etc. But it may be merely the Abstrusa gloss of 83, 10); (217, 23) Cicum: cortex mali granati (from Philox. probably rather than from ps.-Plac. 13, 23 Cicum: granum mali Punicum aut umbilicus lupini. But Festus is suggested by the First Amplonian gloss, tenuis pellis inter grana; cf. Paul. 37 Cicum, membrana tenuis malorum Punicorum. The word is used by Aldhelm laud. virgin. 9, carm. virgin. 236 and 1596); (220, 51) Compernes (-is?): < femoribus compressis? > (perhaps from Philox. 110, 55 Compernis: *σύνυμπτος*. Cf. Paul. 35); (220, 52=42) Comes-satio: comestio (probably, with no. 50 Comessat: manducat, like no. 53 Comissatur, an Abstrusa gloss; cf. 41, 30. If so, not to be connected with Paul. 36); (222, 28) Collibescit: complacet, delectatur; (223, 5) Conierat: simul cum ceteris iurat (cf. the Abavus Glossary Conierat: coniurat).

It is probably too fanciful to connect a curious item, (224, 27) *Cortina*: *responsum*, with Paul. 21, 1 (Aperta idem Apollo vocabatur quia patente *cortina responsa* ab eo dentur) rather than to see in it a (lost *Abolita*) Virgil gloss on Aen. 6, 347 *neque te Phoebi cortina fefellit*. A curious explanation stands in (213, 35) *Camuri boves* (*Camuribus* MSS) : *brevibus cornibus*. The mistake would be intelligible if this item came from the Festus lemma *Patulum bovem* (cf. Paul. 246 *cuius cornua diversa sunt ac late patent*). The *f* for *v* in (214, 31) *Carissa*: *vafra* (*faba* MSS; scarcely for ' *favea*') is a Spanish spelling, a relic of the Spanish *Abolita* archetype; but our *Abolita* MSS offer (28, 3) *Carissa lena est dupla* (cf. Paul. 38 *Carissam apud Lucilium vafrum significat*). While Paulus has merely *Cerritus*: *furiosus* (47), our glossary offers (217, 40) *Cerritus*: *subinsanus ex commotione cerebri* (a Festus gloss?). Festus is suggested by the trio: (218, 20-22) *Creperae*: *in corpore dubitare* (?), *Crepusculum*: *finem noctis et initium diei*, *Creperum*: *dubium* (cf. Paul. 46 *Creperum*: *dubium*, etc.; 62 *Decrepitus est desperatus crepera iam vita, ut crepusculum extreum diei tempus*, etc.), but the second resembles an *Abstrusa* gloss (33, 31) and the only *Abolita* gloss in our MSS offers (33, 9) *Creperis*: *dubiis*. The Second *Amplonian Glossary* has (along with the first of our trio) *Creperae*: *asperae vel dubiae*, *Creperae*: *dubiae, incertae* (cf. *ps.-Plac.* 13, 27), *Crepusculum*: *tempus intra finem noctis et initium diei*; *antiqui enim creperum dubium vocabant, inde et ipsum tempus crepusculum vocabant in quo dubitatur utrum dies adhuc sit an nox*. *Thurneysen* (in the *Latin Thesaurus*) is wisely suspicious of (220, 15) *Columis* (-es): *salvus* (-os). It may be one of the 'ghost-words' that flit about glossaries, for the *in*-symbol was often hardly distinguishable from that of ' *id est*' and ' *columis*' would easily emerge as a new lemma from (let us say) *Reduces*: *salvos, id est columes* (*leg. incolumes*) *reversos*. (Cf. also *Columen* and *Culmen*.) A 'ghost-word' with which all readers of glossaries are familiar occurs in this section (213, 23) *Caplosus*: *illusus*. It is the phantom offspring of the mis-writing of *cōplodus* (i. e. *complosus* or, if the archetype was a Spanish MS, *conflosus*) in the *Abstrusa* archetype, and the phrase referred to was ' *complosis manibus*' or the like. Unless we can credit our compiler with the emendation, the mistake

must have been corrected in the archetype, for we find in our MS the correct form also (220, 33) Complosus: illusus. One more gloss in the C-section demands mention, (223, 31) Combib[i]ones a bibendo dicti (cf. Nonius 38, 11 Conibones, conpotores, a bibendo dicti).

In the D-section: (225, 2) Danista: fenerator (? cf. Paul. 60 Danistae, feneratores); (225, 7) Dapsilis: largus dapibus; (225, 25) Delicat: probat; (226, 23) Depeculato (-tus?): de furto publico, seu depraedato (-tus?) (cf. Abstr. 50, 11); (226, 36) Deglubere: vellicare; (226, 40) Detrectat: valde tractat, contemnit; (230, 34-35) Duellibus: adversariis, Duellum: bellum duorum hominum (cf. Paul. 58 Duellum, bellum, videlicet quod duabus partibus de victoria contendentibus dimicatur; inde et perduellio, qui pertinaciter retinet bellum. The AA Glossary, which drew from a good MS of Abol., has Duellum: duorum hominum bellum). In the E-section (232, 7) Ensito has no claim to be early Latin: it is merely the clumsy St. Gall spelling of Insitum. Indeed the scribe probably ought to have written Insitam, for that is the form of the Abstrusa gloss (98, 17) in our MSS. Extimus too (234, 11) is probably an Abstrusa gloss (71, 5); and even Examussim (234, 5; cf. 70, 4). More worthy of mention are: (235, 61) Exanclare: exhaustire (cf. Paul. 70 Exanclare, exhaustire); (235, 8) Exhaustant: exhaustiunt; (236, 4) Exlex: extra legem. Also (233, 41) Evelatus: spoliatus (hardly identical with Abstr. 71, 14 Exvolutus or Exvolatus) and (233, 38) Evelantur: spoliantur (?? cf. Cyril. 237, 13 Ἀποκαλύπτω: evelo, detego); for Paul. (68) has a lemma Evelatum.

In the F-section (236, 51) Falarica: lancea magna vel genus teli magni (probably the Abol. item, whereas the Abstr. item is that mentioned in its various forms at the beginning of this paper) is rather a Virgil gloss (on Aen. 9, 705) than a Festus gloss. Philologists have welcomed (240, 21) Fuma: terra. It is precisely what the Fem. O-stem *humus* of Latium might be expected to become in other dialects (cf. *hostis* for *hostis*, etc.); and dialectal words are often treated by Festus. Still it may be a mere 'ghost-word', evoked (let us suppose) from a Virgil gloss (on Aen. 4, 24) <Ima tellus:> infuma (-ima) terra. The Plautine (?) interjection of 240, 2 (Fufae: interiectio mali odoris) is quite the combination of sounds by which

we express the same disgust. If our glossary was a Bobbio compilation, this item may have come from the famous Bobbio MS of Charisius. But it may also be a Festus gloss (cf. Plautus Cas. 727, where the palimpsest may have read *foe foe (fufoe?)* and the Palatine archetype *fy fy*. In Asin. 894 not merely our MSS of Plautus but our MSS of Nonius read *tuae*). *Fratria* (239, 6) is an Abstrusa gloss (80, 33).

In the G-section we must emend (241, 22) *Gentiunt anseres* (*leg. Gingriunt*), for it is precisely Philox. 33, 55 *Gingriunt*: *χῆρες ἐκβοῶσιν* (cf. Paul. 84 *Gingrire anserum vocis proprium est*; *unde genus quoddam tibiarum exiguarum gingrinae*); although 'gentiunt' may not be a mere slip of the pen (cf. vulgar Lat. *ganta* 'goose'). There is some suggestion of Paul. 83 (*Genialis lectus*) in 241, 23 *Genialis lectus*: *qui in nuptiis sternitur*; of Paul. 83 (*Genas*) in 241, 34 *Genae*: *mala<e> quae in facie <sunt>*, *id est sub oculis* (cf. Philox.?) ; of Paul. 87 (*Glos*) in 242, 36 *Glos*: *viri soror*.

In the I-section 251, 3 (*Insimulat*: *accusat, fingit*) seems to be a Terence gloss of *Abolita* (98, 3) and 252, 12 (*Investis*: *sine barba*) an Apuleius gloss of *Abolita* (90, 5). Noteworthy are (247, 13) *In procinctu*: *in expeditione*, (251, 12) *Interpola*: *reprobata*. In the L-section 253, 13 (*Lapidina*) is an Abstrusa item (105, 1) and not to be connected with Paul. 105, while 253, 28 *Lactasis*: *metaphora ab infantibus* (*leg. Lactasses?*) may be a Terence gloss of *Abolita* which has dropped out of our MSS. Festus however is suggested by (254, 5) *Lapit*: *cruciat, sollicitat, dolet* (cf. Paul. 105 *Lapit, dolore afficit*) ; (255, 14) *Lingula* (*leg. Lingulaca?*): *arguta (-tus), loquax* (? cf. Paul. 104). The (erroneous) theory that one source of our glossary was ps.-Plac. (and Plac.) finds a modicum of support in (253, 27) *Lampenae*: *stellae fulgentes*. For Plac. (30, 28) offers *Lampenae*: *stellae quidem sic dictae*. And although absent from our MSS of ps.-Plac., the word appears in that Anthology preface which is a mosaic of ps.-Plac. curios. On the other hand our item is quite of the Philox. type. (Notice that 289, 22 *Suppremi* comes, not directly from Plac., but from Isidore Diff. 511.) We must not connect with Festus (Paul. 103) the item (255, 22) *Limis*: *strabo et obliqu<i>s oculis*. It comes from Philox. 123, 28 *Limis oculis*: *obliquis* (*v. l. L. obl. oc.*), where it is perhaps a Horace gloss (on

Sat. 2, 5, 53 sic tamen ut limis rapias, etc.) ; or, less probably, from Abol. 108, 35 Limis oculis : oblique intuentibus, where it is rather a Terence gloss (on Eun. 601 ego limis specto). In either case it is a confusion of *limis* (sc. oculis) with a Nom. Sing. *limis*. Finally may be mentioned (256, 15) Luculleum : genus marmoris albi, (256, 20) Lupercalia : gentium cultura, id est sacra Panis, quia ipse dicitur dedisse responsa ut coirent lupi et hirci. The second may be an Abstrusa gloss (on Virgil Aen. 8, 343 or 663?) ; for Sangall. has filaments that touch the 'English group' of glossaries, a group which seems to have drawn on a fuller version of Abstrusa, containing many long Virgil glosses (apparently culled from valuable 'variorum' scholia).

We end our review of the Festus (or Early Latin) glosses without having found reason to abandon the theory adopted at the beginning, that the two sources of Festus glosses in Sangall. are (1) the Abolita Glossary, (2) the Philoxenus Glossary. It is true that many Sangall. items of this kind do not appear in our extant MSS of Abol. and Philox. But it is more likely that these MSS have omitted a certain number of items than that there existed some imaginary third glossary which, like Abol. and Philox., drew materials directly from Festus. We have no reason to suppose that either Vat. (with Cass.) or the 9th century Philoxenus archetype MS exhibit a perfectly complete text. Our glossary, rightly regarded, provides the means of supplying some of their omissions.

Since it has been shewn to take its Festus glosses from these two sources, and not directly from a text (or epitome) of Festus, Goetz' suggestion (Berl. Phil. Woch. of 1914, p. 874) that Paulus may have used an already existing epitome loses probability.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE UNIVERSITY, ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

II.—VEDIOVIS, THE VOLCANIC GOD.

A RECONSTRUCTION.

In the interesting summary of the geological evolution of the Roman province in Abbate, *Guida della prov. di Roma*, pp. 74-175, a description is given of the Volsinian, Ciminian, Sabatine, Latin, Hernician and other volcanic craters of the province. Soracte was the first mountain to emerge and is non-volcanic. Then came the limestone subsidiary ranges, the Praenestini, Lepini, Simbruini, Sabini. Another upheaval brought up the main Apennine ossature linked with the above mainly by the hills of Frusino, Ferentum and Anagnia. With the Quaternary period came the emergence of the sub-soil of the Roman Campagna and its hills after sub-aqueous volcanic convulsions. The great aerial volcanic eruptions that followed began apparently in the Hernician hills and then concentrated at the Alban crater and were accompanied by great diluvial action. Even before the subsidence of these violent conditions at the close of the Quaternary period, the presence of man on the mountains is proved. Soon after, man came down to the region of the Alban hills and the new coast line, but the active action of the Alban crater did not cease until some time after all other craters north of Campania had become extinct and the only signs of the tremendous activity in the region of Viterbo were its mineral springs such as the famous sulphur pond of *Bulicame*.

It is generally conceded that the primitive Romans, as well as their ancestors and other Italic tribes worshipped deities that embodied the important functions and operations of nature, of which man had either hopes or fears. These deities were not anthropomorphic and anecdotic, like Greek deities, but rather the impersonal essences of these natural forces. It would therefore have been extraordinary if there had not been, among these functional impersonations, a representative of volcanic action in its various forms.

Even a superficial student of the geological history of Rome and Latium is aware of the important rôle that must

have been played by volcanic action during the formative stage of this religion especially at and near Alba, the mother-city of Rome.¹ At that period it was certainly the most violent, obvious and destructive of the natural forces against which the people sought to protect themselves by their more or less magic ritual. Not only was a large part of the Latin territory subject to the effects of the eruptions of the Alban crater, but the volcanic formation on which the people lived still teemed,² even in historic times, with hot springs like the Lautolae in the Forum, or with crevasses like the Tarentum in the Campus, or the Curtian lake (Livy, VII 6, 1), all of which were as much due to the latent activity of the volcanic god as the ashes, lava or lapilli were due to his virulent action, of which Livy still chronicles a number of instances until quite a late period.³ Even the unusual eruption of the Alban crater to which the formation of Monte Cavo was due, when the stream of lava is supposed to have flowed quite a distance toward Rome, seems to have taken place after the founding of the earliest settlements on the Roman hills because the cinerary urns of the Alban necropolis found under the lava belong roughly to the same archaeological period as the tombs in the early necropolis of the Roman forum.⁴

¹ The volcanic region is summarized by Pais (*Stor. crit. di Roma* I 701) : "la vasta plaga che dall' Amiata si stende ai monti di Bolsena, al Cimino, ai colli Albani, alla montagna di Rocca Monfina e in fine al Vesuvio".

² Pais (*loc. cit.*) has an inkling of the truth when, after saying that the great volcanic eruptions had long ceased when the first settlements were founded, he says that their influence remained and that the sulphurous and mephitic emanations of the volcanic area and the numerous thermal springs existing from Viterbo to Rome determined certain fearsome religious rites like that of Soranus, worshipped by the Hirpini on Mt. Soracte, and perhaps also that of Vediovis among the Latins. My paper was written, in its present form, as long ago as December, 1912, and I did not see this suggestion of Pais until July, 1913. In any case Pais did not follow up his suggestion. On the contrary, he states that he accepts the Wissowa theory (p. 701), while elsewhere he actually adopts Preller's asylum theory (I 588).

³ Livy, I 31. 2; VII 28. 7; cf. III 10; XXI 62. 5; XXIII 31. 15; XXV 77; XXVI 23; XXXV 9; etc.

⁴ For a bibliography of the necropolis consult Kiepert-Hülsen, *Formae Urbis*². See esp. Not. Scavi, *Bull. Com. and Röm. Mittheil.* for 1902 and 1903, etc.

We should, then, expect to find among the original *di indigetes* of Rome, among the *di inferi*, a volcanic god: but we do not find such a god. At least, he has not been identified. We need not discuss the philologically tempting Vulcanus. With the Etruscans he was one of the Thunder-and-Lightning-gods. He was among the *di indigetes* of Rome and had his special flamen, and he represented the element of fire. But it was the fire kindled above the earth's surface. He was invoked against incendiary fires; was, in later times, the god of firemen. He was, for instance, worshipped at Perusia after the partial burning of the city by the army of the young Augustus on its capture in the civil war of 41 B. C. His cult was given particular prominence at Ostia where protection of the warehouses against fire was all-important. Vulcanus was, in fact, a sort of personified Fire Insurance Company to whom the Romans paid regular dues. But, he had nothing to do with elemental subterranean fires.

Yet, the real volcanic god has, during all these centuries, been at our hand, waiting to be recognized, his real character forgotten ever since the time when the cessation of any reminiscent fear of danger from volcanic action combined with the growth of scepticism had made the Romans of the late Republic forget his real character, though, with their usual tenacity, they held on to the husk of his cult.

The name of this god is Vediovis. It is variously spelled Vediovis, Veiovis or Vedium. When the Roman antiquarians of the age of Cicero and Augustus began to study the past, his origin and characteristics had been so completely befogged that they and their successors have told us practically nothing about him. Modern critics confess themselves puzzled or quite thwarted. Preller's old conjecture (I 262) that Vediovis was the patron god of criminals, based on the position of one of his temples *inter duos lucos* on the Capitol, where legend placed the primitive Asylum for criminals, is too fantastic to be seriously considered. Fowler¹ says: "We have but his name to go upon, and two or three "indistinct traces of his cult", and he adds that he must "give up the attempt to discover the original nature of this god". Wis-
sowa,² who shares with Mr. Fowler the primacy in matters of

¹ Roman Festivals, p. 121.

² Religion u. Kultus d. Römer², p. 236 sqq.

Roman religion, is a little more definite. He believes that we can at least assert two things of Vediovis: (1) that he was an infernal deity and (2) that he was, as his name indicates, the counterpart or opposite of Jupiter. He supports this with the early Roman formula of *devotio* or ritual sacrifice *pro bono publico* cited by Macrobius, in which Vediovis is associated with the spirits of the dead, the *di manes*, in much the same way that Jupiter is associated with the guardians of the living, the *di penates*. He adds the evidence of late writers who connect or identify Vediovis with Dis Pater and Pluto and make him lord of the underworld at a time previous to the complete dominance of Hellenic ideas. Another suggestion has been contributed by the historian of ancient divination, Bouché-Leclercq.¹ Referring to the table of gods distributed in the sixteen sections of the heavenly templum in the chart of Martianus Capella, according to the system of Etruscan divination by thunder and lightning, he points to the fact that the name of Vediovis appears in the fifteenth of these sections of the heavens and that he must therefore have some connection with thunder and lightning, though he is puzzled to see how this is possible.

A few Roman writers had also indulged in conjectures. Ovid² and Festus³ introduced a needlessly confusing element. They interpreted Vediovis to be the Youth-Jupiter, very much as the god of the shrine at Anxur was the Child-Jupiter. This was based merely on the diminutive aspect of the prefix particle *ve*: thus *VE(D)iovis* = Little Jupiter. This conjecture has been very properly relegated to the waste-paper basket. The two other meanings of the prefix *ve* have also been used as a basis of interpretations: the privative and the excessive or malignant and unregulated. The theory of Gellius⁴ was that the force of *ve* was privative; and that there was in Vediovis the absence of all the positive excellencies of Jove. But Fowler is undoubtedly right in saying that we cannot evolve out of Jupiter merely by subtraction any distinct deity who should be a sinister opposite to Jupiter.

¹ *Histoire de la divination antique*, IV p. 36.

² *Fasti*, III 437-448.

³ *Paulus*, p. 379.

⁴ *N. A.* V 12.

Therefore, in looking to the name as an index of character it would seem as if we must turn to the third idea inherent in the *ve*, the idea of unbridled violence, of undisciplined force, such as is exemplified in *vesanus* as opposed to *sanus*.

Whatever relation there was to Jupiter must therefore have involved not primitive identity but primitive distinction and opposition, though on the same plane. As Diovis ruled heaven, so Vediovis may have ruled a not-heaven. As Diovis personified order and judgment, so Vediovis may have personified disorder and dementia. As Diovis caused and ruled the heavenly thunder and lightning, so Vediovis caused the subterranean thunder and lightning. We will see later how much corroboration there is for this interpretation.

Aside from these conjectures of Ovid, Festus and Gellius, based on the name alone, what are the stray hints that have reached us from Roman times and that must be the basis of any interpretation?

- (1) Inscription of the late Republic of the Gens Iulia at Bovillae on altar to Vediovis.
- (2) Mention in the primitive calendar of an agonium, apparently in honor of Vediovis.
- (3) Varro's statement that Vediovis was a Sabine god introduced into primitive Rome.
- (4) Early formula of *devotio* associating Vediovis with the *di manes*: and reference to ancient rituals with mention of Vediovis in Gellius.
- (5) Mention of two temples of Vediovis in Rome and appearance of his name three times in the calendar.
- (6) Appearance of Vediovis among the gods in the Etruscan scheme for divination by thunder and lightning as given by Martianus Capella.
- (7) Description of a statue of Vediovis in his Capitoline temple in Ovid and Gellius.
- (8) Sacrifice of a goat to Vediovis, *ritu humano*, reported by Gellius.
- (9) Reference to the *Fulmen Veiovis(?)* in Ammianus Marcellinus.
- (10) Connection between Dis Pater and Vediovis in Martianus Capella.
- (11) Connection between Apollo and Vediovis in Gellius.

I will now analyze this material, beginning with the inscription at Bovillae, which is the only record of Vediovis that has been found outside of Rome and the only inscription to him.

This inscription was on an altar found at Bovillae. Gell¹ gives a drawing of the altar and describes it as of rough peperino and says that it 'has since perished'. Its lines, with the pinched neck above the base are quite early. They are almost exactly paralleled at the latest in an altar of the year 9 B. C. with archaic outlines now in the museum of the Antiquarium Comunale at Rome, illustrated by Pais;² by a still earlier one dedicated 151 B. C. to the god Verminus, in the same museum; and, much earlier by the tufa altar of the Black Stone which is usually ascribed to the fifth century B. C. or earlier. It was evidently the usual form down to the close of the Republic. The inscription CIL. I 807 reads, in two sections:

VEDIOVEI PATREI GENTEILES IVLIEI
VED[IOVEI IV]L[E]I[A]ARA LEEGE ALBANA DICATA

The altar was dedicated by the Julian Gens, and the inscription seems to be the only known dedication to Vediovis. Its early date, perhaps the second century B. C., and its context, give it greater value as a document than anything else, not even excepting the testimony of the calendar and the description of the statue. The three cardinal points are: the name *Pater* given to Vediovis; the fact that the altar was dedicated according to a certain special ritual, the *lex Albana*; and thirdly the bearing of the site itself where the altar was found upon the character of the god.

The qualification of the god as *Vediovis Pater* is indicative of two things: of the primitive and also of the important character of his cult. Mars Pater, Janus Pater, Quirinus Pater, Saturnus Pater, Liber Pater, Neptunus Pater, Terra Mater, Mater Matuta, Dis Pater are other deities to receive this sort of surname and they belong to the foremost and earliest of the Roman gods. Also this is one of a very small class of inscriptions in which a Roman gens declares its adoption of a patron god.

¹ *Topography of Rome, etc.*, p. 123.

² *Ancient legends*, p. 166: cf. Helbig, *Führer*¹ I pp. 595-596.

The second point, the use of the *Lex Albana* in the dedication of the *ara*, is not only a most unusual circumstance, but one which in this case is fundamental. It indicates that the cult of Vediovis was centered at and derived from Alba, and that the regulations that governed it were formulated in a specific Alban ritual. It will be evident why this was so as soon as we admit the volcanic connection of Vediovis. Let this be admitted before it is proved, for the sake of argument. Given the fact that the Alban crater was the centre of volcanic action in this region previous to the iron age; given also the fact that around it has been found archaeological material that connects the Albans with the prehistoric *terramare* and that is earlier than any yet found in this part of Italy,¹ it follows that the cult of the volcanic god would naturally originate and centre at Alba.

Further, as Bovillae was only about three miles distant and so was directly within the danger zone, an altar to a volcanic god would be particularly appropriate here. It would also be natural that the volcanic cult should linger here at its centre long after it had lost all significance in Rome itself.

The presence of Vediovis on the calendar² is important, but rather difficult to use in any definite manner except as showing the primitive character of the cult and its place in the festivals of the whole people. The primitive calendar of Numa contains the mention of an *agonium* on May 21, a date connected with Vediovis. There seems no absolute certainty as to the original nature of an *agonium* except that it was a festival of the whole people and of the most primitive period, with which the earliest of the priestly authorities, the *rex sacrorum*, was connected. The juxtaposition of the *agonium* of May 21 with Vediovis is a further indication that his cult antedated the Republic and that he ranks with the *di indigetes*. Two other calendar days are marked as his festivals in later redactions of the calendar, each of them in connection with

¹ See, for a good summary of this question, Modestov, *Introd. à l'histoire romaine*, *passim*. Important material bearing on this connection and but little known existed in the Museo Kircheriano at Rome, and has recently been, I believe, moved to the Etruscan Museum at Villa Giulia.

² Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, 121-122, 277-278. Wissowa, *loc. cit.*

one of his two temples. On March 7 there was a ceremony at his temple on the Capitol *inter duos lucos*; and on January 1 was the anniversary celebration of the dedication of his temple on the Island.

Is it allowable to infer that the existence of two temples was made necessary by the change in the pomerium? The primitive shrine of the god *inter duos lucos* was originally, according to a theory with which I heartily agree, outside the pomerium, as we should naturally expect in the case of one of the *di inferi*. Fowler regards the sign of the god Terminus that was the only emblem not removed from the lower spur of the Capitol to make way for Jupiter O. M., to have been the stone that marked the pomerium of the primitive Quirinal city on that side.¹ At all events this part of the Capitol hill, including the depression between the two peaks, remained outside the *urbs* of the Four Regions, and consequently outside the early pomeria—supposing that there were pre-Servian pomeria. Are we to infer that when the pomerium was enlarged so as to include the Capitol it became impossible to perform the ritual of Vediovis in the Capitoline temple and that it was necessary to build a second temple on the Island outside the new pomerium? In this case the older temple would have been retained as a sacred place, as in other cases, but the real activities of the cult would have been transferred to the Island. Against this is the apparent contemporaneousness of the two temples: we should have to suppose that L. Furius Purpureo who vowed the temple on the Island in 200 B. C. began it in 196 and dedicated it in 194, and who is said also to have built, a few years later, in 192, the temple on the Capitol,² was, in the latter case merely doing a work of reconstruction, as we may infer not only from Ovid but from a passage in Dionysius.³

¹ Roman Festivals, 326-7; cf. 230.

² The passages in Livy relating to the construction of these temples are corrupt and the name of Vediovis has been restored in both cases. The Island temple is referred to in XXXI 21. 12, and the Capitol temple in XXXV 41. 8.

³ Dionysius of Halicarnassus II 15 (cf. II 10, 3) in describing the founding of Rome speaks of the temple in the asylum as having been consecrated by Romulus and says that he cannot say to what god or genius it was dedicated.

The only hints as to the character of this cult are given in the passages that refer to the cult-statue of Vediovis in his temple on the Capitol, evidently of early character. Of it Pliny says (N. H. XVI, 216): Have we not the statue of Vediovis, made of cypress wood, still preserved in the Capitol, ever since its dedication in the year 561 of the city?¹ Ovid makes him beardless and Gellius presupposes this in comparing him with Apollo. Gellius speaks of the arrows which he holds, and Ovid calls attention to the fact that he does not hold a thunderbolt. Both writers tell us that the statue was accompanied by a goat.² Gellius adds that it was the custom

¹ Nonne simulacrum Veiovis in arce e cypresso durat a condita urbe DLXI dicatum? The numbers are uncertain and the DCXI of the MS has been amended to DLXI or DLX.

² The full texts of Ovid and Gellius may be quoted here:

Ovid, Fasti III 429: *Una nota est Marti nonis sacrata quod illis
Templa putant lucos Vediovis ante duos
Romulus ut saxo lucum circumdedit alto,*

435: *Ne tamen ignaro novitas tibi nominis obstet
Disce, quis iste deus, curve vocetur ita.
Iuppiter est iuvenis. iuvenalis aspice voltus:
Aspice deinde, manu fulmina nulla tenet.
Fulmina post ausos caelum adfectare Gigantes*
440: *Sumpta Iovi. primo tempore inermis erat.*

*Stat quoque capra simul. nymphae pavisse fe-
runtur
Cretides, infanti lac dedit illa Iovi.*

445: *Nunc vocor ad nomen. vegrandia farra colonae
Quae male creverunt, vescaque parva vocant.
Vis ea si verbi est, cur non ego Vediovis aedem
Aedem non magni suspicer esse Iovis?*

The passage in Gellius N. A. V, 12 begins by an interesting reference to early rituals with prayers to Vediovis: "In antiquis precationibus nomina haec deorum inesse animadvertisimus; 'Diovis' et 'Vediovis': est autem etiam aedes Vediovis Romae inter arcem et Capitolium..... 'Iovem' Latini veteres a 'iuvando' appellavere . . . cum Iovem igitur et Diovem a iuvando nominassent, eum contra deum qui non iuvandi potestatem sed vim nocendi haberet . . . Vediovem appellaverunt, dempta atque detracta iuvandi facultate. 'Ve' enim particula . . duplicum significatum . . capit. Nam et augendae rei et minuendae valet . . . Simulacrum igitur dei Vediovis, quod est in aede de qua supra dixi, sagittas tenet, quae sunt videlicet partae ad nocendum. Quapropter

to sacrifice to Vediovis a goat according to a special ritual: *immolaturque ritu humano capra.*

For Ovid it was the goat Amalthea that fitted with his explanation of Vediovis as the boy-Jupiter. It is to be noticed that Ovid presupposes on the part of his readers absolute ignorance as to Vediovis and that even the name will be strange to them (*novitas nominis*). This agrees with the agnostic attitude of Dionysius of Halicarnassus already noted. It agrees also with the fact that Gellius says that Vediovis was quite commonly confused with Apollo because of the arrows in his hand. But it should be noticed that no bow is mentioned, and, as will appear later, the arrows are the symbols of the straight volcanic bolts—the subterranean lightnings. They are contrasted with the forked bolts of the sky lightnings of Jove. The assimilation to Apollo would be, of course, entirely to the destructive element of Apollo.

The connection of the goat with Vediovis is characteristic. It is well known that Greco-Roman mythology and ritual associated the goat with the underworld, especially with elemental heat. Wissowa has called attention to the perfectly logical *taboo* placed on the goat for the Flamen Dialis. Among the things that this priest of Jupiter was forbidden to touch beside a dog, raw meat, beans, ivy, wheat and leavened bread was a goat.¹ This appears only another indication that

eum deum plerumque Apollinem esse dixerunt; immolaturque ritu humano capra eiusque animalis figuramentum iuxta simulacrum stat."

Wissowa (p. 296) speaks of the statue as holding *bow* and arrows, but there is no warrant for this in Gellius. The absence of any mention of a bow, both in Gellius and Ovid, favors the interpretation of the arrows as straight thunderbolts.

A coin of the gens Fonteia is considered by Babelon (Monn. de la républ. I 506 f.) as representing Vediovis; and there is a considerable group of republican family coins and bronze statuettes which represent a youthful beardless thunder-god. Thulin regards him as an Etruscan form of Jupiter, excluding in every case the ascription to Vediovis. What the young god is holding on these coins can readily be thought a straight thunderbolt such as the Etruscans considered the thunderbolt of Vediovis to be as we shall see. These coins will be referred to later.

¹ Gellius X 15, 12: Plut. Quaest Rom. III; cf. Fowler, Religious Experiences of the Roman people, p. 34, and Frazer, Golden Bough, I 241.

Jupiter and Vediovis and their cults were, so to speak, mutually exclusive.

The use of the Human Rite in connection with the sacrifice of the goat is interpreted by Wissowa (pp. 237-8) to refer not to an original human sacrifice for which a goat was substituted, but to a service for the dead.¹ It will appear later that while this is true, the peculiar function of Vediovis in later times of permitting souls to escape to life among the stars, places the act in the later historic period in a sort of intermediate position, partaking of both ideas. For, of course, the sacrifice *ritu humano* brought the animal so sacrificed into the category of *hostiae animales* or vicarious sacrifices in which the life only and not the body was dedicated to the god. It was said to be a doctrine of the *Disciplina Etrusca* that through this kind of sacrifice² souls could be in each case set free from the infernal regions and transformed into spirits and genii, that is into *di animales*. This appears to have been described in the *Libri Acheruntici*, which formed the last section of the *Disciplina Etrusca*³ and treated of life beyond the grave. In its earliest form, even, this connection of Vediovis with souls and the infernal regions cannot antedate the time of Etruscan influence and must be eliminated from any consideration of Vediovis as a Latin deity. If the goat was originally connected with him the association must then have been due to the idea of heat and fire.

Little attention seems to have been paid to the passage of Varro which makes of Vediovis a primitive Sabine god introduced into Rome at the beginning by Titus Tatius. Varro (LL. V 74) quotes from the Annals a list of the Sabine gods worshipped in primitive Rome: *arae Sabinum linguam olent*; *quaes Tati regis voto sunt Romae dedicatae*; *nam, ut annales dicunt, vovit Opi, Florae, Vediovi, Saturnoque, Soli, Lunae, Vulcano et Summano, itemque Larundae, Termino, Quirino,*

¹ The analogy which he finds to the cult of Soranus on Mt. Soracte is valuable and confirms my volcanic connection, for there was undoubtedly a volcanic legend of primitive character connected with Soracte, even though the mountain itself was non-volcanic.

² Arnobius. II 62: *neque quod Etruria libris in Acheronticis pollicetur, certorum animalium sanguine numinibus certis dato divinas animas fieri et ab legibus mortalitatis educi.*

³ Thulin, *Die etruskische Disciplin*: cf. Serv. Aen. VIII 398.

Vortumno, Laribus, Dianae Lucinaeque. The source for such a list is probably not earlier than the third century B. C., and while of no particular value in proving a Sabine origin is an interesting confirmation of the primitive character of the god.

The association with the *di manes* is quite early. It appears in the formula of *devotio* already referred to. The usual formula of the early type seems to have been the offering of one's life on behalf of the Roman people to *Tellus* or *Terra Mater* and the *di manes*. This is the formula in Livy. But in another formula of less early origin, perhaps, a male chthonic deity is substituted for *Tellus* by the side of the *di manes*. This would seem to have been at first *Vediovis*. Then, with the introduction of Hellenic ideas, *Dis Pater* was added and the formula in Macrobius (III 9, 10) is *Dis Pater, Veiovis and the Manes*, which was the formula used by the Roman commander at the Siege of Carthage, showing the stage reached in the course of the second century B. C. It is probable that shortly after this *Vediovis* disappeared from the formulas, especially as *Pluto* was brought in on the Hellenistic wave to reinforce the Greek conceptions of the underworld.

Long after *Vediovis* had disappeared from the horizon of active Roman cults, at some time in fact under the empire, there came an archaic revival of his cult, or rather of his personality, which finds expression in such writers as Ammianus Marcellinus and Martianus Capella. Such a recrudescence of an entirely obsolete divinity would be unintelligible and of no significance if it were not due to a certain particular cause. It is a peculiar fact, the importance of which has been well demonstrated by Thulin, that it was not until almost imperial times that the books forming the *Disciplina Etrusca* were translated into Latin and so made available beyond the small circle who knew the Etruscan language. The comparatively early Etruscan cycle of religious works with their ritual and divination formulas, handed down from a period hardly later than the sixth century B. C., were appropriated by late Roman writers in very much the same way as sculptors of the age of Augustus or Hadrian reproduced archaic works of Greek sculpture of the sixth and fifth centuries B. C. These Roman echoes of Etruria are all that we have; and while they are in form quite late, it is a fact that the hyper-idealism

of the Neo-Platonic, Gnostic and Mithraic age was far more in sympathy with the pan-naturalism of primitive thought than Roman thought had been at any time between the Punic wars and the age of the Antonines. The writers of the fourth century A. D. were, therefore, in a far better condition to understand the meaning of Vediovis than the writers of the Augustan age. It is in the two authors just mentioned that I find the clearest evidence of the volcanic character of Vediovis.

It is recognized that the Roman historian of the time of the Emperors Constantius and Julian, Ammianus Marcellinus, was a student of the Etrusca Disciplina in its Latin dress. He not only says so himself but proves it by giving a synopsis of some of its doctrines. Now, in describing the vicissitudes of an expedition sent from Gaul by Julian against Constantius in the East, under the command of Severus, his *magister equitum*, the historian speaks of a curious psychological phenomenon which he thinks could hardly be explained on natural grounds. This Severus, who had hitherto been a bold and active leader, turned suddenly timorous and supine (XVII 10, 2): "mortem fortasse metuens adventantem, ut in Tageticis libris legitur Veiovis fulmine mox tangendos adeo hebetari ut nec tonitrum nec maiores aliquos possint audire fragores". This fear of death connected with sudden deafness which afflicted those who were destined to be destroyed by an earthquake or eruption, or, as he puts it, by the *fulmen Veiovis*, which suddenly developed in Severus, is explained if one turns back a couple of pages in the text of Ammianus, and reads the excursus on the subject of earthquakes in which he indulges. Just at this time there were taking place terrible earthquakes over a wide area in Macedonia, Asia and Pontus. Many cities were ruined, and the detailed description which he gives of the destruction of Nicomedia (XVII 7, 1) has remained famous, to be placed beside Pliny's description of the destruction of Pompeii.¹

This leads Ammianus Marcellinus to refer to the ritual and pontifical books and to the ceremonies prescribed in them in connection with and for protection against such calamities. Among these ancient manuals were the *Libri Tagetici* of the *Disciplina Etrusca*, which he had consulted. Doubtless it was

¹ Cf. Ammian. Marc. XXXIII 5, 10.

in them that he found deafness and hebetude as symptoms of those destined to be struck by the *fulmen Veiovis*. It was not in a Roman source, for as we have seen the Romans had forgotten, five centuries before, their national beliefs of this sort and in this connection it is interesting to quote a passage of Varro (ap. Gell. II 28): *Quoniam et qua vi et per quem deorum dearumque terra tremeret incertum esset.* On the other hand that the Etruscans, who are acknowledged to have derived their divination from Babylonia,¹ did actually possess such a manual is made quite certain not merely by the historic reliance in the Etruscan science of divination by thunder and lightning on the part of the Romans but from the fact that such a treatise on divination from earthquakes is actually known to have existed in Babylonia and Assyria and to have been translated in Greek, so that it was probably among the earliest Etruscan documentary assets.²

My interpretation of the *fulmen Veiovis*³ as the subterranean lightning of volcanic eruptions finds support in Pliny, Caecina (ap. Senecam) and Martianus Capella.

The Romans themselves were satisfied with regarding all day lightnings as from Jupiter and all night lightnings as from Summanus,⁴ apparently a nocturnal Jupiter. For any more particularized speculations they called upon the Etruscan experts. The Etruscan system required a division of the heavens for divination by thunder and lightning into sixteen

¹ See Jastrow, Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria, p. 195: cf. his *Die Religion Babyloniens u. Assyriens*, pp. 800, 320-321 and *passim*. Modestov, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

² Bezzold u. Boll, *Reflexe astrolog. Keilschriften bei griechischen Schriftstellern* (in *Abhandl. Akad. Heidelberg*, 1911): cf. Jastrow, *Die Religion*, etc.

³ The unfamiliarity with the name Vediovis, MS Vagonices, has caused some doubt as to the reading of the word in the MSS, but, as in the case of the two passages of Livy regarding the temples of Vediovis, the reading Vediovis may be accepted. Thulin refuses to accept the reading Vediovis and prefers Begois. In this he goes against Gelenius, Eyssenhardt and Bormann; see *Arch. Epig. Mitth. aus Oest.* 1887, XI, p. 100, and Thulin, *Etr. Disc.-I*, *Die Blitzlehre*, pp. 4, 36.

⁴ Wissowa, 124, 472; Fowler, R. F., p. 160-161. The connection of Summanus with the manes and underworld, which Wissowa denies, is asserted by Martianus Capella (II 161) and confirmed by the black animals used in his sacrifices and by Arnobius V 37 and VI 3 whom Wissowa himself cites.

sections radiating from the centre, four in each of the four divisions made by the intersecting lines of cardo and decumanus S-N and E-W, and beginning at the north running east and south. The number is certified by Cicero and Pliny,¹ but it is in the extraordinary work of archaic erudition of Martianus Capella that these sixteen divisions are described as to their spiritual content, beginning at the upper or north pole and working down from left to right. The auspicious omens occur in the first eight divisions, those of the left, the inauspicious originate in the right hand half; the very luckiest being near the north end on the left and the most unlucky near the same point on the right. It was, of course, understood that, in marking out this *templum*, the auspicious faced the south and so had the east or source of fortune on his left.

In each of the sixteen divisions Martianus Capella² places presiding gods or spirits, according to a scheme which is generally granted to be of Etruscan origin. On the unlucky right or west side, in the Fifteenth section, next to the last, is the name Vediovis together with the *di publici*. The last, or Sixteenth section, is ruled by the god of darkness, Nocturnus, while on the other side of Vediovis, in section Fourteen, is Saturn, also exerting a dark and evil influence. Beyond, in Thirteen and Eleven, are the *di manes*, the underworld spirits.

By the presence of Vediovis in this scheme and by the company he keeps we are confirmed in the belief that Vediovis was both a thunder and lightning god and also that his sphere of action was infernal. Now Bouché-Leclercq considers these two characteristics irreconcilable. Thunder and lightning belong to the sky and it did not seem to him as if they could by any reasoning be connected with the infernal regions³: and yet he was obliged to recognize the coexistence of both characteristics in Vediovis. He was reduced to the suggestion that the *fulgura* of Vediovis might be those very low on the horizon! But as the horizon is certainly as much as any other a part of the sky this is no solution, and the difficulty itself seems not to have been met or even stated by any other writer.

¹ N. H. II 54, 142; cf. Cicero de div. II 18, 42.

² I, 15: cf. Nissen, Das *Templum*, 182 sqq., and Bouché-Leclercq, Hist. de la divin. IV, p. 23 sqq.

³ Hist. de la divin. IV, p. 36, n. 5.

The solution, however, is extremely simple. I found it in a study of the various classes of fulgurations catalogued by the Etruscans. The most detailed summaries of the Etruscan scheme are given by Pliny and Seneca. The latter statement¹ is taken from Caecina's monograph on the subject which is based on the Etruscan system. Now Caecina gives eleven distinct categories of *fulgura*, and of these one is not celestial but infernal, coming up from the bowels of the earth: *inferna* (*fulgura*), *cum e terra exilivit ignis*. He is, of course, describing volcanic eruptions or emanations under a term that will include all varieties. Pliny also gives volcanic eruptions as a form of fulguration recognized in the Etruscan system.² His remarks on this part of the subject are more detailed than on any other and need quoting here because they also explain the arrows in the hand of the statue of Vediovis already alluded to. He says that those *fulgura* which the Etruscans call *infera* are the most frightful and destructive, coming not from the heavens but from the near-by and turbulent forces of nature. Their strokes do not fall obliquely, as do the celestial bolts, but straight, and are regarded as coming from the earth, *creduntur e terra exire*.

That the idea of a subterranean form of thunder and lightning was not peculiar to Etruria but was a familiar one to Greece can readily be proved, as, for instance, in Aeschylus, Prometheus 1103 sqq., *βρυχία δ' ἡχῷ παραμυκάται | βροντῆς, ἔλκες δ' ἐκλάμπουσι | στεροπῆς ζάπυροι, κ. τ. λ.*

It may then be taken for granted that infernal fulguration formed an intrinsic and important part of Etruscan divina-

¹ Q. Nat. II 49.

² N. H. II 138: *Tuscorum litterae novem deos emittere fulmina existimant, eaque esse undecim generum; Iovem enim trina iaculari. Romani duo tantum ex iis servavere, diurna attribuentes Iovi, nocturna Summano, rariora sane eadem de causa frigidioris caeli. Etruria erumpere terra quoque arbitratur, quae infera appellat, brumali tempore facta saeva maxime et exsecrabilia, cum sint omnia, quae terrena existimant, non illa generalia nec a sideribus venientia, sed ex proxima atque turbidiore natura. Argumentum evidens, quod omnia superiora e caelo decidentia obliquos habent ictus, haec autem, quae vocant terrena, rectos. Et quae ex propiore materia cadunt, ideo creduntur e terra exire, quoniam ex repulso nulla vestigia edunt, cum sit illa ratio non inferi ictus, sed adversi. For earthquake thunder see the *Vita* of Gallienus, § 5, and Gordian, § 26. Ceres and Persephone were invoked after them: Obseq. 43. 46.*

tion; and that while celestial fulguration could be both lucky and unlucky, this infernal fulguration was unmitigatedly evil.¹

The personification of this natural force among the Etruscans as well as among the Italic peoples was undoubtedly Vediovis. His relation to Jupiter, as presiding over a corresponding yet radically different mode of action is now clear. The undisciplined violence of this action is well rendered by the prefix *ve* in one of its meanings. Though his source of energy is distinct from Jupiter's,—one the heaven and the other the underworld,—their field of operation coincides.

There is in the museum of the Antiquarium Comunale at Rome what seems to be a representation of Vediovis.² It is reproduced in Pais, *Ancient Legends*, p. 166, under the caption "A Roman deity". The figure occupies the centre of the gable of some small monument. The upper part is half-man and half-bird, while the lower half is in the form of a double coiled serpent. The head is that of an old bearded man, and from his shoulders stand out two large wings. In his right hand he holds a thunderbolt of three straight bolts and his left hand is raised. There could hardly be imagined a better way for Roman Art under Etruscan influence to figure Vediovis. The serpent represents his fundamentally chthonic nature; the straight thunderbolts the subterranean fulgurations; the wings and feathers the aerial flight of the volcanic matter.

It is mainly due to the keen perception of Babelon that Vediovis has been recognized on a number of Roman family coins of the late Republic, not in the doubtful bearded form of the relief just described, but in the guise of a beardless youth such as the descriptions of the cult statue of Vediovis in Ovid and Gellius would lead us to expect. First of all is a coin of the gens Iulia of 88 B. C., issued by L. Julius Bursio.³ It should be placed at the head of the series because the Bovillae inscription shows that the gens Iulia was addicted to the cult of Vediovis. The youthful head has curly hair and a laurel wreath, with Hermes wings at the temples. On the reverse a Cupid is trying to break over his knees a bundle of arrows in

¹ See Ammianus Marcellinus, *loc. cit.*

² Helbig's *Führer* does not mention it.

³ Babelon, *Monnaies de la rép. rom.* II 6-8.

the form of thunderbolts—probably a form of *taboo* to prevent harm from volcanic eruption. The wings are natural in a god of aerial activities. In regard to the laurel wreath it is interesting to note¹ that according to Etruscan and Roman tradition the laurel tree cannot be struck by lightning, so that it is natural it should be consecrated to Vediovis, who was probably regarded as its co-protector with Jupiter.

Perhaps to the same year (88 B. C.) belongs another important Vediovis coin, that of M. Fonteius C. f.,² already recognized by Müller-Wernicke as a Vediovis. This is even more convincing than the Julian coin because besides the lightning under the head on the obverse, the reverse is occupied by the youthful genius of Vediovis on a goat, with the bolt repeated underneath. In some cases there is an interesting connection with the Dioscuri and the Lares of Rome, represented either by their caps or their full-seated figures. An interesting coin of the gens Caesia, of slightly earlier date, gives Vediovis on the obverse as a bust, seen almost from the back and turning to the left. He is in the act of launching a handful of arrows—the straight lightning bolts. The two seated Lares with their dog occupy the reverse (Babelon I, 281). Probably this act of launching the bolts is a reproduction of the cult statue. The same type and the same act is repeated in a coin of the gens Licinia, issued c. 82 B. C. by C. Licinius Macer (Babelon, II 133). The launching is done by drawing the right hand back sharply above the shoulder.³

If, on the one hand, the Etruscan, Sabine and Latin connections of Vediovis might lead us to consider him a generic Italiot divinity; on the other hand, his volcanic character

¹ Thulin, art. *Haruspices in Pauly-Wissowa*, p. 2448 with a reference to Pliny, N. H. II 146, XV 153.

² Cohen, *Med. Cons.* pl. 18, 5; Babelon, *ibid.*, I 506 sqq.; 507, 10; Müller-Wernicke, *Ant. Denkm.*, pl. V. 15; p. 60: "Die Vorderseite zeigt den lockigen, bartlosen Kopf des lorberbekränzten Veiovis . . . Unter dem Kopfe der Blitz. Auf der Rückseite erblickt man in einem Lorberkranze den Genius des Veiovis als geflügelten Knaben auf einer Ziege nach rechts reitend; unterhalb wieder den Blitz".

³ Other types of Vediovis appear on coins of the gens Ogulnia (Babelon II 266) and of the gens Gargilia, previous to 81 B. C. (Babelon I 532), though these are not as convincingly identified. It is a question whether the deity in a quadriga launching the thunderbolt on the reverse of the Ogulnia coin is a Vediovis or a Jupiter.

would restrict the area of his cult to the sections of Italy where volcanic action was feared, during the period approximately between 1000 and 600 B. C., that is, South Etruria, Latium, Campania and their vicinity. The weakening of volcanic action in historic times, except in a very few centres, accounts for the early obscuration or obliteration of the cult, which lasted longest in the Alban neighborhood.

It would seem as if there were not one of the facts connected with the god and his cult that does not harmonize with the volcanic theory. More than this, no other theory explains them all as it does.

Beginning as a god of certain early tribes such as the Latins and Sabines, he was adopted by the Etruscans and given a place in their system of divination. To them are probably due certain developments in the evolution of his cult. In his primitive form he must be thought of as an earth deity and not as an underworld deity in the Hellenic sense. It has been well said that the primitive Italians cared and thought very little about the underworld. He was chthonic like Terra Mater, only more subterranean in that he had no normal contact with the earth's surface. When the cycle of Underworld gods was brought into Roman religious thought by Greek influence, one quite sees how, in a spirit of fun, a Roman wit could create a new class of middle gods, *di medioximi*,¹ the earth-gods that the old Romans loved, half-way between the sky-gods and the new gods of the underworld ruled by Dis and Persephone. In this shifting of cosmic scenery it was natural that Vedovis should be juggled into the underworld, as we have seen, and should be associated or confounded with Dis-Pluto. In this connection I must discuss somewhat at length a curious late attempt to galvanize the Vedovian cult. It has but little connection with my theory except as an instance of the infiltration of combined

¹ Wissowa¹, 33 A. 5; 188 A. 8: Plautus, Cist. 572, at ita me di deaeque superi atque inferi et medioxumi. But was it just a joke with Plautus? When Serv. Aen. III 134 says: quidam aras superorum deorum volunt esse, medioximorum id est marinorum focos, inferorum vero mundos, he seems to refer in a twisted fashion to what was perhaps a transitory but real distinction before the supremacy of the Hellenic underworld had become thoroughly established.

Hellenic and late Oriental ideas into a primitive Etrusco-Roman substratum.

I find the clearest trace of this archaic revival in a passage of Martianus Capella, whose chart of the heavenly templum shows him, as we have seen, to have been acquainted with the place of Vediovis in the Etruscan fulgural system. He makes his principal allegorical impersonation, Philology, obtain immortality through a magic brew and not by anyone of the several more or less magical methods advocated by different Eastern and Western systems. The first of these methods to which he refers is the Etruscan, which makes the soul escape by means of Vadius or Vediovis. But Philology is not to pass through his hands: *quod nec Vedium cum uxore conspexerit sicut suadet Etruria* (II 142). Exactly what rôle Vadius plays in Martianus Capella appears further in the text where, after discussing Pluto as Summanus and the various classes of infernal spirits such as the Manes, Lemures, Larvae and Maniae, he describes the disturbed region of fiery Phlegethon in Hades where the conflicting currents of heat and dampness produce a condition of continual noise and disturbance, a region of suffering through which souls restlessly flit. This region of Pyriphlegethon is presided over by Vadius also called Dis or Veiovis.¹ One is at once reminded of Pliny's description of the violent interaction of compressed hot and cold air as the condition producing earthquakes;² of the name Φλέγρας πεδίον given to the volcanic plain of Campania, and of the various fulgural and volcanic connections of the root φλέγω and its derivatives.

¹ Martian. Cap. II 40-41 (166) Circa ipsum vero terrae circulum aer ex calore supero atque exhalatu madoreque infero turbidatus egredientes corporibus animas quodam fluenti aesti collidens non facile patitur evolare. Hincque tractum Pyriphleghonta sollertia poeticae adumbrationis allusit atque in eo perenni strepitu voluntata colliditur animarum, quas Vadius adjudicarit, impietas (id est <Pluton>) quem etiam Ditem Veovemque dixere. Ipsam quoque terram qua hominibus invia est, etc. The volcanic connection is employed in Plato's Phaedo, p. 113 B. Cf. Odyssey X 513, Vergil Aen. VI 550 ff. See Lucian's *κατάπλους*, ch. 28, and for a bath in the Pyriphlegethon, the Dialogues of the Dead, ch. 30.

² Pliny II 81 says that the trembling of the earth resembles thunder in the clouds and the yawning of the earth (in volcanic eruption) is like bursts of lightning.

The section of the infernal regions then, over which Vediovis presided, according to this account in *Martianus Capella* was the *Pyriphlegethon*, or region where earthquakes and eruptions were produced, and throughout which souls were balloted back and forth on conflicting currents. What is not clear is how far the sphere and character of Vediovis was expanded to amalgamate with the Hellenic concept of Dis-Pluton, and how far it can be ascribed in the form here given to it to an Etruscan source.

Does this also help to define the relation of Vediovis to the *hostiae animales*, to the sacrifice of the goat *ritu humano*, and to the somewhat late concept of the escape of souls from probation or torment to the abode of the blessed?

It seems implied in *Martianus Capella* that according to the Etruscan system the souls passed out by means or by permission of Vediovis. The passing back and forth of souls was a familiar idea in various forms of palingenesis, reincarnation, temporary visitations to the world of mortals by the manes, lemures and other spirits. In the *Aeneid* (VI 685) Vergil has voiced the current conception as to the form in which souls were even then, and more commonly in later times,¹ supposed to pass out and upward as pure atoms of the original fiery energy or aether, of the active force of fire. This is in harmony with the ideas of Stoicism and astrology as to the origin of souls from the mass of fiery aether and with the vivid fancies of Plato. The expulsion of souls in the form of fiery atoms, through openings violently made in the earth's crust by the agency of the volcanic god Vediovis, is therefore a method thoroughly in harmony with all that we know of ancient thought.

But while recognizing this we must guard against two things: (1) against ascribing to the original Vediovis or even to the Etrusco-Roman Vediovis any of the later anthropomorphic and infernal ideas connected with the Dis-Pluto cult introduced by Hellenism: (2) against doing the same for ideas connected with life in and beyond the stars which were

¹ *Serv. Aen.* IV 56 and III 231: a lost work by Labeo was entitled *De Diis animalibus*; cf. *Macrob.* III 5, 1-4, with reference to a work by Trebatius, in which the second species of *hostia* is that in quo sola anima deo sacratur, unde etiam haruspices animales has *hostias vocant*.

an even later introduction of the post-Alexandrian and imperial ages, though current long before then in Oriental and Hellenic spheres.

In other words it must be recognized that while there was in early Italic-Etruscan religion a strong element of doctrine as to life beyond the grave, represented in the *Libri Acheruntici*, and that, in view of the derivation of Etruscan ideas from Babylon this doctrine may have had a sidereal aspect; still, it is clear that scepticism and Hellenism had almost obliterated such early beliefs, until they were revived in more philosophical, elaborate and extreme forms, in the late Republic and the empire, and finally remodelled by belated scholarship through a study of Etruscan documents.

All that can be safely predicated of the post-Etruscan concept of Vediovis in so far as it related to life after death, is that he is thought to preside over the passing out of souls in the form of fiery atoms from a place of torment to one of bliss and immortality, wherever that may have been, and that this act could be brought about by the vicarious sacrifice of a goat *ritu humano*, on behalf of the dead person. At the same time the connection of the goat with Vediovis was probably much earlier than any such association of ideas and goes back to a fairly early Italico-Etruscan ritual.

A. L. FROTHINGHAM.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

III.—AN OXFORD SCHOLAR.¹

Owing to the death of Cook Wilson, the eminent Aristotelian and close friend of Ingram Bywater, the preparation of a memoir of the great Oxford scholar was committed to another intimate, Dr. Jackson, the former Rector of Bywater's college, Exeter. In the change of biographers something may have been lost in the way of detailed description and minute analysis of Bywater's achievements in the special line of work with which his name will ever be associated so long as Greek scholarship abides, but the essentials are there and as others have emphasized, the individuality of the scholar and the man could hardly have been more vividly portrayed. The biographer himself disappears. There is hardly a word from Jackson about Jackson. Such self-effacement is rare and we cannot call Bywater up to tell us what Jackson meant in his life. The other influences of time, place and person are brought out now in sharp outline, now in bright colours; and near friend as well as casual acquaintance will rise from the perusal of the fascinating volume with a truer appreciation of a rare personality.

Bywater's life was the typical life of a scholar, the life of a *λάθε βιώσας* man. It had not the adventitious interest of contact with great military, great political movements. In the Seven Years' War Reiske is a figure not to be forgotten. Paul Louis Courier was a soldier as well as a Hellenist. In the German War of Liberation many philologists went to the front and in our Civil War many scholars of military age—the Southerners almost without exception—shewed that the martial notes of Tyrtaios had not lost their edge. It was only the other day that we were told how a Cambridge don, accounted the chief among the younger Hellenists, had acquired a different fame

¹ Ingram Bywater. The Memoir of an Oxford Scholar 1840-1914. By WILLIAM WALROND JACKSON, D.D., Honorary Fellow, formerly Rector, of Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1917.

as the drill-master of a rifle corps; and in a recent number of the American Journal of Philology an eminent English scholar is quoted as lamenting that he was too old and too deaf to be of active service to his country,¹ a lamentation not without echo on this side of the water. It was only as the shades of night were gathering about his head that Bywater was confronted by the spectre of a war that throws a ghastly light not only on the present and the future but also on the past of all that lived and loved the life of German scholarship as he did; for though Bywater had never studied under German masters, he was thoroughly familiar with German methods and doubtless counted among his highest honours those that came to him from the Berlin Academy. When the crisis came, he was heart and soul with his people. οὐ γνώμῃ διπλόᾳ θέρο βουλάν
But he felt the wrench.

So rapid has been the process of estrangement that one hesitates to say what might have been said three years ago that his ideal of scholarship was German rather than English. And yet the German domination was over all who wished to do anything serious. In 1869 Bywater wrote to Bernays 'I am quite aware how much my dissertation falls short of a German standard of philological knowledge'—a humility hardly justified by the ruck of German dissertations, accepted as they are by those who are supposed to hold up the German standard. Many years have passed since the utilization of every German dissertation was deemed essential to the completeness of any line of research. But exactness and exhaustiveness are characteristic of the best German work and exactness and exhaustiveness were characteristic of Bywater. What he achieved was not to be done over again. On the other hand, on the English side, if you choose, there was in all his work a neatness and a finish in the presentation of his results that one misses in the cumbrousness of so many German performances. 'Versus et cetera ludicra' he left behind him in his undergraduate days, and he was evidently of the opinion of Cobet as to those 'qui Graeca carmina pangunt quae neque Graeca sunt neque carmina'. True, Latin was to him a precious vessel, not merely a conventional vehicle, but he had no fondness for oratorical

¹ A. J. P. XXXVIII 211.

display, or for display of any kind and when it became a part of his official duties as Regius Professor of Greek to present candidates for honorary degrees, he gladly transferred the task to his friend Farnell. There may have been a touch of Bywaterian mischief in the assignment of claims that he may have deemed mythical to a distinguished mythographer. No stronger contrast could be imagined than that between Jowett and his successor, both in ideals and practice. Jowett revelled in translation, Bywater was averse to it, and when he yielded to the demand, it was not so much translation as paraphrase that accompanied his text. The charm of Jowett's translations is undeniable. They have brought him imperishable fame, but for the technical Grecian the charm is soon dissipated and in difficult passages one recalls the words of an audacious critic who said apropos of Jowett that sitting astride upon a fence is endangering to virility. It is a transgression of one of Ritschl's memorable precepts¹ which is a Biblical precept as well. There must be no halting between two opinions.

Of course Jowett figures in this volume, as who does not among the classical scholars of England? For Dr. Jackson has given us a portrait gallery of the time, a series of etchings that may serve as an accompaniment to Sir John Sandys' sketches of the scholars of the nineteenth century. Fifty at least of the names in Dr. Jackson's Index have crossed the track of my own studies and appear for good or evil in the thirty-seven volumes of the American Journal of Philology; and one can readily imagine the hero of Dr. Jackson's story, as he reflects an exemplar here, appraises a fellow-worker there, and turns on this and that figure the light of a wit that burns as well as illuminates. He did not lisp in Greek as in later days he somewhat maliciously lisped in English, but when he took up the study he made admirable progress in it and his father provided his only child with tutors of exceptionable ability, James Bryce, Robinson Ellis and T. H. Green. That was before the era of sports, whereas in 1880 when I reported the performance of

¹ Ritschl's words are: *Nicht mit schiefen halben Gedanken ohne ein-drängliche Interpretation sich begnügen* (Ribbeck, Friedrich Ritschl I 240). Approximately rendered A. J. P. V 350: Don't be satisfied with half notions, squinting thoughts. Go to the heart of the matter in your interpretation.

the Agamemnon at Balliol, I recorded the characteristic fact that the chief actors were among the leading athletes of the University. Bywater cared for none of these things. Even the river had no charm for him. Nor was there so much personal guidance in studies then as there is now. And after all there is such a thing as too much guidance. The American college teachers of my generation were much more poorly equipped for their work than the preceptors of to-day, but there are oldsters who are grateful for the freedom granted them to work out their own salvation or damnation, as the case might be. The light came to Bywater in large measure from luminaries without the college walls or from the beaming faces of his college-mates. Bywater's great hero was Carlyle; and to the end of his days, we are told, he had much of the spirit of Carlyle and like his friend, Swinburne, accorded him the first place among the writers of his day 'on account of his literary gifts, his hatred of shams, his penetrating and incisive criticism of conventional beliefs'—the things that won the allegiance of Thackeray. Among Bywater's friends was Walter Pater¹; with Swinburne his relations were especially cordial and William Morris was also one of his intimates. Jowett predicted for both Bywater and Pater a first class in *Literae Humaniores*, but Pater fell from scholarly grace into the arms of the Graces of Style and however he may have succeeded in reëmbodying the spirit of Plato, he failed lamentably in mastering the technicalities of Greek scholarship. The other half of Jowett's prophecy came true. In 1862 Bywater left college with a first class and in 1863 he was made Fellow of Exeter College; and a Fellow of Exeter he remained until the year of his marriage in 1885. The duty of providing for his mother, which the death of his father devolved upon him, a duty which he discharged faithfully for forty years, barred any prospect of marriage, and he settled down to the life of the college of

¹ A. J. P. XV 93. In after years Bywater wrote what seems to me an admirably just estimate of Pater, too long to quote entire. One extract must suffice. 'His style I do not like; it seems to me affected and pretentious and often sadly wanting in lucidity. It is much admired by a small but devout body of followers, very superior persons in their own view though of little importance in the view of the large literary public in this country.' (I. B. to Diels.)

which he was to be the great ornament. Soon after his election to the Fellowship he became intimate with Mark Pattison, one of the determining influences of his life, and Dr. Jackson devotes page after page to a characteristic of that remarkable scholar for whom in after years—sad to relate—Bywater's friend and fellow-admirer of Carlyle, Swinburne, had no better title than that of an *Ape of the Dead Sea*.¹

Pattison and Pattison's brilliant wife—afterwards to be the wife of Sir Charles Dilke of unhappy celebrity—formed the centre of a unique society into which Bywater was drawn and of which he became a privileged member. Pattison was the representative of the tendencies which ultimately gained the upper hand in the direction of academic studies, the removal of confessional restrictions, the shifting of weight from college to university, the admission of the claims of physical science. In the Pattison circle the continental atmosphere was regnant and Bywater had prepared himself for the Pattison environment by acquiring a practical familiarity with the German language, which at that time was not a common accomplishment in English universities.² In the last thirty years of his life, Pattison's interest was concentrated on classical learning, its methods and its relation to life. 'Classical learning i. e. a knowledge of human nature as exhibited in antiquity'—such was his thesis—'expands the soul as no other learning can expand it' and in this faith he upheld the scientific ideal of scholarship in opposition to those who considered 'the refinement of taste and of the critical faculty and the command of Latin and Greek as instruments of literary skill to be the best fruits of scholarship'. Bywater's view of the functions and responsibilities of scholarship coincided with Pattison's; he had the same conception of thoroughness as Pattison. To him as to Pattison, Scaliger was a model and Bywater was to treat the late Aristotelians as Scaliger treated the writers who held precious fragments of the Eusebian Chronicle. Bernays' Life of Scaliger was and is an inspiration, and like Pattison—to continue Dr. Jackson's summary—Bywater never forgot that the final end of scholarship was to throw light on literature and

¹ The Nineteenth Century, 1893, p. 916.

² A. J. P. III 228, al.

history. But Bywater, we are told further, was not merely receptive, he always preserved his individuality, always complied, it may be added, with the canons of taste, which Pattison violated with a certain savagery. No such jumble of metaphors can be produced from the works of any scholar as may be found in the writings of Mark Pattison.¹

Bywater early recognized the limitations of the province he had marked out for himself. A happy lot is the lot of the specialist after all.

Beatus ille qui procul negotiis
<Angusta> rura bobus exercet suis.

Within these bounds he kept himself. It cost him some effort to do it, says Dr. Jackson. It meant the renunciation of popular fame. 'He was little known', says the *Spectator* in a sympathetic notice of Dr. Jackson's *Memoir*, 'outside his own circle, even in Oxford, except as a profound Aristotelian'. It was a self-denying ordinance which could best be appreciated by those who knew or divined the vast range of his knowledge. And it is this concentration that commands the respect of those who belong nominally to the same guild and yet are prone to seek the key of the fields and shy their doctor's caps over the mills of the gods of Greece and Rome, though as they shy them they are not so lost to the technicalities of their business as not to remark on the current mistranslation of the proverb:

οὐκε θεῶν ἀλέοντι μύλοι, ἀλέοντι δὲ λεπτά.

The mills of the gods grind late, not slowly, and pulverizing criticisms are sometimes kept back for a score of years.

Like Pattison and through Pattison, Bywater cultivated the acquaintance of Jakob Bernays, a personality unforgettable to an old Bonn student.² There was an intellectual kinship between the two men, with their wide knowledge, their incisive style, their mordant wit. The privatdocent of 1852 was not so awesome a figure to me as he became in later days when Usener copied one of his essays with his own hand³ and when Bywater

¹ A specimen of Pattison's style is given in *Hellas and Hesperia*, p. 24: "Even at this day a country squire or rector in *landing* with his *cub* under his *wing* in Oxford finds himself very much at *sea*."

²A. J. P. XXXIII 230.

³A. J. P. XXVII 228.

wrote him those reverential letters—among the few that have been preserved.

Another thing Bywater had in common with Pattison—and that was the passion for collecting rare books. He was elected a member of the Roxburghe Club in 1891 and continued to take an active part in its proceedings until his death. The marvellous editions that he brought together he bequeathed to the Bodleian but he did not cling to the possession of his books in the 'contemplor in arca' spirit, for he made generous gifts to scholars who were working in the same line with himself. But though Bywater had so much in common with Pattison, he was, as Dr. Jackson has rightly insisted, no *umbra* of anybody. There went out of him the spirit of true scholarship. His touch was sharp and clear and masterly and both in his reserves and his achievements there was an impress of finality. His work was a carven monument, not a chance Monte Testaccio and there are those who would gladly exchange the ready evocation of miscellaneous reading, the sophistic legerdemain of far-fetched combinations, the joyous play of frolic fancy for the good conscience of a solid contribution to the sum of that which is known. This is not merely the old 'optat arare caballus' story. Everyone who has been consecrated to scholarship hopes to do something that will abide, be it never so little, something that will live on in company with the index-maker, the palaeographer, the framer of irrefragable formulae.

Dr. Jackson's third chapter deals with social life at Oxford for the twenty years that lay between Bywater's entrance upon his fellowship and his marriage. He had, as we have seen, settled upon the work of his life, the study of the language and literature of Greek philosophy—no narrow range to any just conception of the undertaking. Homer is the Okeanos that compasses all Greek life, out of which and into which flow all the streams of Hellenism. But such is the connexion of all the waterways of the Greek paradise, that any one channel leads to all, and Aristotle is, as Bywater himself has said,¹ a syndicate of the wealth of Hellenism; and an intimate knowledge of the Greek language in its literary manifestations from the

¹ He used to say, 'Aristotle in his later years at least became a syndicate'.

beginning to the latest exponent of the doctrines of Academy and Lyceum is a prime condition for the work Bywater had set himself to do ; and those who sneer at scholia and scholiasts as Rutherford did¹ are in great danger of laughing as did the suitors of Penelope ; and the 'supra grammaticam' gentlemen that interpret Plato expose themselves to the divine smile of the great prose poet, if indeed there be a limbo in which the ancient worthies meet their modern commentators. Somehow Plato's smile would be more withering than the 'Hohngelächter der Hölle'—to use a favourite German phrase that suits the diabolism of the present day. Bywater knew his Greek and when one thinks of him one recalls what Fontenelle said about the hand full of truth and the opening of the little finger.

Bywater, we are told, was not the advocate of any philosophical system. His business was to find out what his text meant, not to fit the meaning when found into a scheme of his own. 'Some form of Hegelianism had perhaps more attraction for him because of the intellectual basis of the system'. But apart from this, all classical study in his day, which I may call my day, was steeped in Hegelianism. The air swarmed with winged words from the Hegelian oracle. In 1850 historians of Greek philosophy walked humbly on the lines of the Hegelian logic. Indeed the revolt against the Hegelian triads² of Greek literature arose within times that seem to me, an ancient of days, comparatively recent. Bywater's admiration of Matthew Arnold belongs also to his time. George Bernard Shaw introduces his cultured American³ as still in the Matthew Arnold stage. In 1861 some of my fellow-campaigners carried in their scant baggage copies of Matthew Arnold's essays. Men trained in Continental schools were in sympathy with Arnold's criticisms of English character and English methods. The proud disdain that overspread his features was reflected by his disciples. Few of the younger men of that day were not blinded by the flash of his epigrams ; few hesitated to accept his convenient formulae. Among German writers Heine was Bywater's favourite—and no wonder. Heine was what the Hebrews call the mouth of the sword, and Bywater was a master of incisive speech. Such a one too was Swift, another favourite of Bywater's—and

¹ A. J. P. XVIII 245.

² A. J. P. XXXVI 110.

³ A. J. P. XXXIII 106.

indeed eighteenth century literature had an especial attraction for him, as it has for all who love neatness and despatch.

College commons, Dr. Jackson tells us, in 1864 were much more centres of intercourse between the members of the different colleges than they have since become. The life of the common room at Oxford, of the combination room at Cambridge was fading out when I first knew it. Family life had begun to displace college life and the Punch of the day made merry over the perambulator that thrust the chariot of the Muses off the track. In some of the smaller colleges, the foreign guest sometimes found himself alone with his host and on one occasion that I recall the lamentation over the neglect of Pindar was coupled with a lamentation over the decline of port. But there were still 'noctes cenaeque deum' and still more delightful are the memories of the gatherings in the rooms of the individual dons; and this is the kind of hospitality which Bywater favoured and in which he shone, the bright talk revolving about his precious collection of books, enriched from year to year. In 1866 he went abroad largely to make the acquaintance of Zeller and so came into contact with the fringe of war. The hotels were full of Prussian officers—'far less imperious and offensive then than they afterwards became'. My acquaintance with Prussian officers goes back to the Berlin of 1850-1851, and Kranzler's 'Conditorei'. Anything more imperious and offensive than the 'Herrn von der Garde' of that date is to me hardly conceivable. But in all things the Germans go on to perfection. Still at the time under consideration, there was nothing of the 'Schrecklichkeit' which is the watchword of to-day, and there was something like chivalry in the bearing of Borussian warriors and Bavarian toward one another.

With all Bywater's admiration of German scholarship, he was not blind to the defects of the German mind, to the self-conceit that led both scholars and men of science to depreciate the literary and scientific achievements of others and became so marked after 1870, the year which made so deep a cleft in my own life.¹ On Pattison's advice Bywater refrained from engaging in a literary feud with Teichmüller, the author of

¹A. J. P. XXXVI 240.

'Literarische Fehden' and himself not disinclined to controversy. A legitimate instance of being too proud to fight. Bywater was quite alive to the danger of overspecialization, and though Dr. Jackson calls no name, it was doubtless Bywater who pointed out in *Athenaeum* or *Academy* the egregious lapse of Lucian Müller who undertook to correct Vergil's 'contemplator item'¹ which he took for a fragment of a lost writer.

At the time of the Franco-Prussian War, Pattison was anti-Gallican, as were most of the Oxford residents. But Bywater distrusted Germany from the first and 'the cultivation and the spirit and refinement of the educated Frenchman were far more to Bywater's taste than the self-assertion of the average German', his 'grasping and pretentious attitude'. Still his friendships were formed with scholars irrespectively of nationality, whether it were Bernays or Mommsen or Taine or Renan. But Bywater lived long enough to declare himself wholeheartedly on the side of the Allies and the famous rescript of the 93 was accepted as a finality just as it has been by so many who have had closer ties with Germany than ever Bywater had.

The twenty years that followed Bywater's election to the Fellowship of Exeter saw many academic changes. Large sums were expended in promoting the study of natural sciences. Students were allowed to become members of the University without belonging to College or Hall. Girls as well as boys were admitted to local examinations. Colleges for women were founded and University examinations thrown open to them. The movement known as University Extension was set on foot, but from this movement Bywater, though a liberal, stood aloof, as was to be expected of his fastidious nature. Nor is it surprising that when the great question as to Compulsory Greek came up he was in favour of freedom. Not that he underrated the cultural value of Greek, but he had the 'Pierian spring' attitude of the eighteenth century. Whether he consoled himself, as I have consoled myself this many a year, with the belief that the cubic contents of Greek study were greater than ever, I do not know.² The Test Act by which the endowments were

¹A. J. P. XXXVII 498.

²'I see the handwriting on the wall everywhere', he wrote in May 1906, 'even in Germany and am not hopeful as to the future of the old humanities'.

secularized met his hearty approval, and the only public controversy in which Bywater was ever involved had to do with that reform. The improvement of teaching was one of his great concerns, but he took little active part in the training of pupils. Among his few pupils were Driver, the eminent Hebrew scholar and Macan, the editor of Herodotus.¹ His teaching, we are told, was characterized by finish and thoroughness. He was not content to correct mistakes. He gave an example of the kind of answer that he himself would have returned to the question set. It is an open secret that your successful coach is the man who knows the examiner as well as the subject, but with this psychological study Bywater had no sympathy. The fads of an examiner had no interest for him. 'His Honour pupils were often the subject of very pointed sarcasms. But they rather treasured them than resented them. The undergraduate will forgive a great deal to a man whom they admire and who is never commonplace or humdrum.' So Dr. Jackson, who knows. 'Humdrum' reminds me of the plaint of a German usher. I cannot recall the exact words, but the following echo may serve as an illustration:

Humdrum, humdrum, humdrum, humdrum,
My heart is woe, my brain is numb,
My mental vision's choked with gum.
I never could be made to stomach
Caesar's Bellum Gallicum.

But that was long before the new methods that have made Caesar as alive as he was to Cleopatra.

Another innovation was a scheme of joint lectures open to all the colleges and Bywater's lectures on Aristotle's Poetics and Plato's Republic were crowded by the Honour men and the lecturer 'produced a profound impression on those who followed them as an original master, an exemplar of critical scholarship, in private, a most amusing talker and raconteur'. But that was in the days before English Guides to Conversation uttered their ban against anecdotes. It is not surprising that in his hours of ease he did not spare the great Master of Balliol any more than did Archer-Hind. When Bywater succeeded Jowett, the appointment was received with marked coolness in certain quarters, but when one compares Jowett's

¹ A. J. P. XVII 126.

original equipment for the office and recalls the 'howlers' that were afterwards attributed to him, the disparity in the eyes of a technical scholar is almost absurd.

At this point Dr. Jackson goes into some detail as to the controversy in regard to religious tests—a matter of minor interest to American scholars, and takes occasion to refer to Bywater's general attitude to religious belief. 'Bywater's ideals', he says, 'were too purely intellectual for him ever to be regarded as an example of the *anima naturaliter Christiana*'. But, as Bywater said of his friend Nettleship, 'there was a serious religious vein in his nature' and he had no sympathy with the coarser forms of theological liberalism. 'He was not the man to weaken the religious influences which helped to mould the character of young men under education.' 'He accepted the possibility of a future life, without any searchings of heart, in the firm conviction that the seeker after truth, if he were true to his vocation, had nothing to fear.'

Bywater's love of books, his familiarity with manuscripts seemed to designate him as the successor of Coxe, the guardian angel of the Bodleian, who watched over his treasures with almost superstitious care and resented any careless touch of a precious parchment; and Bywater was induced to act as sub-librarian for a while, but the conditions were unfavourable to anything like research. His great friend, Mark Pattison, said, 'The librarian who reads is lost' and Bywater would have been one of 'la perduta gente' for he wished to be a librarian who reads.

Bywater's Bibliography—his list of Books and Articles prepared by himself shortly before his death—contains only forty numbers, a comparatively small output for forty years of unceasing literary activity.¹ Of fugitive notes in Academy and Athenaeum he took no account, but only those whose business it is to write fugitive notes are aware how many hours of study and research are sometimes necessary for a single paragraph.

¹Cf. A. J. P. XXXVII 502 fn. 'Great students in any department', says Dr. Jackson (p. 143), 'leave a permanent impression only through the influence exercised on younger men by their personality and example. Much of Bywater's higher work bore fruit in the labors of others, which would never have been undertaken but for his guidance and inspiration'.

Of public performances of an oratorical character, he was a sworn foe, as has already been noted. Bywater's chief works were his *Heraclitus*, a memorable performance, the compass of which gives no notion of its difficulty, his *Priscianus Lydus*, which he undertook under the commission of the Berlin Academy, and which brought him in unstinted praise from the foremost German scholars, the specimen of his edition of *Diogenes Laertius*, the edition which was to have been the great achievement of his life—*Madonnas of the Future* are most of our great achievements—his edition of the Nicomachean Ethics and the Poetics of Aristotle with a commentary and a manner of paraphrase—for this master of Greek seems to have been of the same opinion as Boeckh concerning translation as a warrant of supreme scholarship.¹

A critical estimate of these works, which constitute Bywater's title to a permanent place in the annals of classical study, would carry me beyond the scope of this paper, which is nothing but a summary of Dr. Jackson's admirable memoir, with sundry irresponsible intercalations of my own. Nor am I the man either to make or even to report such an estimate. An admirer of Aristotle has called him 'iron in one's blood'. Physically I have never been able to take any preparation of iron, and that may have been the trouble with my digestion of Aristotle. But that disability does not prevent my admiration of an Aristotelian, certainly not of any man who does inevitable work in the right spirit. So much philological work becomes negligible in a short time. To do work that is inevitable, and to put that work in reasonable compass and crystalline form, that is the best one can hope for. Every one of the publications I have mentioned shews the hand of the master. Every one involved long and laborious quest. But it is not Bywater's achievement that has tempted me to this holiday task. It is the combination of the personal charm of the subject of the biography and my entire sympathy with his conception of the scholar's vocation.

In 1883 Bywater was appointed to a Readership in Greek, a position which I once sought to have established in the Johns Hopkins University, an admirable coign of vantage for a scholar who is waiting for something better, if indeed there

¹ A. J. P. XXX 353.

is anything better. The very vagueness of the title is attractive though, of course, it is exposed to glosses. When Bywater was asked 'What is the difference between a Reader and a Professor?' the characteristic reply was 'A Reader is a man who reads, a Professor is a man who professes to read'. Indeed I think that most scholars balk at the title of Professor which answers very closely to the ancient 'sophistes', but when it was suggested that Praelector would be a better word, 'Which means, I suppose', rejoined Skeat, 'a man who lectures before he has read'.

In 1885 Bywater married and this vacated his fellowship. Thenceforth the London house became the centre and 93 Onslow Square a name to conjure with. Delightful memories cluster about it and a perfect stranger to me betrayed me into a tangled correspondence by pleading his intimacy with the sacred number. Mrs. Bywater had been the wife of a scholar, a Fellow of Exeter from 1851 to 1864, the date of his marriage, who kept up his relations with the former Fellows of his college. His last year as Fellow (1863-1864) was Bywater's first, and the acquaintance thus formed was continued until Mr. Sotheby's death in 1877. Mrs. Sotheby had entered heartily into all her husband's studies. She was a diligent student of classical Greek, a devotee of Homer, a mistress of Modern Greek and counted among her friends Comparetti, a review of whose famous Virgil in the Middle Ages was the last literary performance of her first husband. If, as it has been maintained, mutual admiration is the surest warrant of love, no married pair had a stronger assurance of happiness than those two, and to the truth of the inscription on that joint monument 'His amor unus erat' all who were privileged to enjoy the hospitality of that beautiful abode can bear witness. 'The marriage was not one of intellectual sympathy alone. It was a marriage of affection on both sides.' She brought a mellow afternoon light into his life, and when after a rarely happy union he was left alone by her death in 1908 in the absence of kindred of his own he found solace in the companionship of those who had been brought near to him by his marriage. Still he could say with Wallenstein 'Die Blume ist hinweg aus meinem Leben'. He withdrew more and more into the company of his beloved books. Happy the man who has the collector's passion. It

ranks next—up or down—to the passion for work—or let us say ‘writing’. ‘Je continue à écrire’, said a French man of letters, ‘incapable de faire autre chose’.¹

But let us turn back to the chief event in our hero’s academic life—his election to the Regius Professorship of Greek in the University of Oxford, made vacant by the death of Jowett in 1903. The Regius Professorship of Greek at Oxford is in the gift of the Crown and therefore at that time was in the gift of Mr. Gladstone, who took this duty seriously. Of the two Greek scholars in Oxford, between whom, we are told, it would be hard to discriminate, Ingram Bywater and David Binning Monro, Provost of Oriel, Monro’s eminence as an Homeric scholar might be thought to have been a recommendation in Mr. Gladstone’s eyes, for Mr. Gladstone was a noted Homerist. But Mr. Gladstone’s Homeric scholarship was of a very different type from Monro’s and furthermore Monro was excluded by Mr. Gladstone’s own rule that no head of a college was to be made Regius Professor of Greek. Bywater, it is true, was known to have made merry at Mr. Gladstone’s expense in the matter of his Homeric essays but, as I have had opportunity to know, English scholars are the most generous of men toward their critics and play the game of scholarship as they play all other games. Of course there was the usual muster of testimonials. Whether they were printed or not for Mr. Gladstone’s edification does not appear. We Americans are often charged with a lack of taste but there are English scholars who join with us in revolting against the circulation of printed recommendations in support of rival candidates for academic positions—these ‘Süssigkeiten’ as my fellow-student Vahlen called them in a letter to me apropos of ‘Festschriften’. Vahlen estimated such things at their right value. It makes one shiver, at least it makes me shiver, to think that Rutherford had been pressed upon Mr. Gladstone and doubtless that ‘Simia Cobeti’

¹After Mrs. Bywater’s death, Bywater resigned his Professorship. ‘I have a strong feeling that a professor should not remain at his post after his energies have begun to wane.’ <It was to prevent such a mistake that the Carnegie Foundation was established—and 93 Onslow Square was a manner of Carnegie Foundation. J. E. B. Mayor when his audience was reduced to one undergraduate offered to resign but his resignation was not accepted. A dead line is best after all.>

could have produced testimonies enough; he had admirers enough, has them still—but his learning reminds me of what one reads of the Carso in the Austriaco-Italian campaign.¹

The succession to Jowett naturally gives rise to reflexions on the different ideals and the diverse performances of the two representatives, one the apostle of research, the other the champion of culture in the English sense. ‘The application of Greek philosophy to life, not the knowledge of Greek, was Jowett’s main interest.’ Jowett was what we call a popularizer, the French, a ‘vulgarisateur’—not in the bad sense—and Dr. Jackson maintains that Jowett was a popularizer in the best sense and quotes Jebb’s saying that Jowett made Plato an English classic. Jebb’s testimony seems to weigh more than that of John Bright who declared Jowett’s work to be better than Plato could have done. But John Bright knew no Greek and Jebb’s rare compliments must always be carefully perpended. For that matter the Authorized Version is an English classic, the great standard of a noble tongue, and yet it was not so long ago that Bywater’s pupil Driver complained that the translators were ignorant of elementary Greek syntax,² and he who wishes to know what the text means must look farther. ‘Jowett’, says Dr. Jackson, ‘was not a scientific scholar any more than he was a scientific theologian’, Dr. Jackson himself being both scholar and theologian. Bywater’s conception of scholarship has already been emphasized. It is the conception that dominates our American scholarship—and as our scholarship is an offshoot of the great German Ygdrasil, we come back to questions that have recently been discussed at length both in England and America. Both Jowett and Bywater, urges Dr. Jackson, would have been agreed in the doctrine that the ultimate aim of learning is to throw light on literature and history. ‘But in order to do this we must have a thorough and intimate knowledge of the remains of antiquity and Jowett was impatient of the minute research by means of which the divinations of genius are rendered possible and acquire a certainty that would otherwise be unattainable.’ And, as Dr. Jackson goes on to say, ‘the scientific ideal of learning does nothing to dull the

¹A. J. P. XVIII 245; XXX 359.

²A. J. P. XXXV 362.

sense of beauty or impair the consciousness of affinities between Greek thought and the highest cultivation of our day'. But that is a theme upon which I have been discoursing ever since I undertook academic work more than sixty years ago and the title of one of my deliverances The Spiritual Rights of Minute Research has been cited to shew my attitude to the great question. It is this common ideal that commanded the sympathy with Bywater and the admiration of Bywater expressed by such men as Zeller, Usener, Vahlen, Gomperz—Gomperz himself a shining proof that there is no incompatibility between research and imagination. The German Muse is not always as formless as the German Hausfrau is commonly supposed to be and the *δύνατος δρθός* must be held to deliver his message in the clear and penetrating tones of the Greek singer. Bywater's Inaugural Lecture on Three Centuries of Greek Learning in England, a precious document doubtless, has not survived. As it is easy to divine, the native causticity would not have been lacking as the discourse neared its close. At heart Bywater was a kindly man and in the wholesale destruction of letters and papers, wasp's nest and honeycomb alike perished. There is not much material from which to reconstruct the image of a personality 'at once impressive and winning'. A few specimens are given of his table talk,¹ but these sparks from the

¹ Table talk is often entertaining but almost as often misleading. Fallen leaves give no just notion of the living foliage. Still Bywater was given to epigrams and once made he was apt to repeat his aphorisms unchanged. From Professor J. E. B. Mayor's ed. of Tertullian's *Apologeticus* Introd. xiii I learn that he said to Mayor what he said to me in almost exactly the same words: 'One could read a very large part of such a writer as Plutarch in the time that is occupied on the small volume of Thucydides.'

I often think that modern education is a conspiracy on the part of schoolmasters and dons to keep men babies until they are four and twenty.

The reason <why a satisfactory biography is so rare> is that while people are alive to whom it refers, the truth cannot be told and after they are dead it can seldom be ascertained.

anvil do not restore the picture of the artificer at his work which was his play as well. 'It is difficult to convey to strangers',

The clergy are very *good* men and knowing this allow themselves a latitude of conduct which you and I could not possibly afford. <The same thing has been noted in regard to quotations from Scripture. >

'There are various reasons for buying books. Some people buy books for the contents and that is a very vulgar reason; and some people buy books for the binding, and that is a little better and not so vulgar; and others buy books for the printing, and that is really a very good reason; but the real reason for which to buy a book is the margin! Always look at the margin.' <'The margin is the thing', has a wider application. Every life should have a wide margin of interest. >

It is not so good for the intellect <to do too much palaeographical work> and the work is tolerable only when there is a distinct literary end in view.

Clever, certainly not; they have no cleverness, only an enthusiasm for cheap causes.

He called the United States the great breeding-ground of popular crazes and did not care for a superfluity of conveniences such as are necessary to the American notion of comfort. 'I do not like', he said, 'a performing house'.

A connoisseur of furniture, he said, 'The good becomes venerable with age, the bad simply shabby.' <Which applies to another kingdom as well. >

<A man's fancy for this or that witticism is a key to his taste and one more item may be added to these specimens. Bywater was a great smoker and here is an anecdote in which he took delight. >

Pio Nono, when in conversation with Cardinal Antonelli lit a cigarette and handed the case to the cardinal who said, 'You know, Holiness, that I have not that vice.' 'You know, Eminence, that if it were a vice, you would have it.'

says Dr. Jackson, 'the impress a strong individuality leaves on the minds of his friends. It cannot be done by a mere enumeration of characteristics'. But no one can read the Memoir that Dr. Jackson has consecrated to his friend without some vision of a man whom to have known at all is 'to have gained a new conception of the potentialities of scholarship'—a man whose life is a lesson for American scholars. Generous recognition and adoption of all that is best everywhere. No surrender of nationality.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

POSTSCRIPT:—As I leave this bantling to its fate (Pind. O. 6, 45; comp. P. 4, 98) an Epimethean shiver comes over me lest some pick-thanks like the anonymous gentleman who laid a hypermetric hexameter to my charge (A. J. P. XXXV 234) should remind me that I ought to have indicated the omission of a line in my quotation from Horace (p. 397). There is a hypermetric line in Jebb's famous Bologna ode,—or was it Abt Vogler?—but I have shewn (l. c.) that the accusation brought against me was a railing accusation. In this case I might have written: *Ut <Teuta> gens mortalium*—but I have no warrant for 'Teuta' = 'Teutonica' except metrical stress—*ἀνάγκα μετρόθετ*, comp. *ἀνάγκα πατρόθετ* (O. 3, 28)—the same stress that brought about the portentous 'probuerunt' in Professor Postgate's Latin verses published in the Literary Supplement of the Weekly Times (Nov. 8, 1917). 'bobus suis' = 'original research'. Comp. the German student's 'ochsen' = 'to grub'. 'büffeln' is used in the same sense.

B. L. G.

IV.—GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM.

[CONCLUDED FROM A. J. P. XXXVIII 311.]

II. Shrine stele of brown sandstone. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Height, 0.402 m.; width, 0.342 m.; thickness, 0.032 m. The rectangular plane surface bearing the inscription has been cut into the stone so as to leave at the two sides and across the top as it were a frame about 0.05 m. in width and about 0.0015 m. in relief. Of the two lower corners the right lacks the frame just mentioned and the left has been badly fractured. The inscription consists of nine lines of crude capitals which exhibit an uncial tendency and belong apparently to the first or second century A. D. The work throughout is very poor. The inscription has been marred by long deep diagonal scratches.

ΠΑΠΟΥΣ ΟΙΚΟ
ΔΟΜΗΣΕ ΤΗΝ
ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΝ
ΥΠΕΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ
5 ΚΑΙ ΤΗC ΤΥΝ
ΑΙΚΟC ΚΑΙ Τ
ΩΝ ΤΕΚΝΩΝ
ΛΔ ΦΑΡΜΟΥΘΙ

ζ

Παπούς οίκο|δόμησε τὴν | προσευχὴν | ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ | καὶ τῆς (γ)υν | -
αικὸς καὶ τῶν τέκνων. | Λ (= έτοις) δ (= 4) Φαρμοῦθι | ζ (= 7).

As we know nothing of the circumstances attending the discovery of this stone, and as the inscription contains no mention of the name of a god, it is impossible for us to determine whether the shrine, or oratory, designated by the stone

was dedicated to the worship of an individual god or to a group of gods; nor can we tell whether it was erected on private property or was one of a number of similar shrines situated in a large sanctuary. It is probably, but not necessarily, non-Christian (see note on *οἰκοδόμησε*).

Πατρός: An uncommon Egyptian name attested in Aeg. Urk. aus d. K. Mus. zu Berlin, gr. Urk., I, 153, 5; II, 468, 6; IV, 1067, 1, and perhaps identical with **Παθούς** (Grenfell and Hunt, Amherst Pap., Gr., II, ind.), and **Παπεούς** (e. g., Grenf., Gr. Pap., 1st ser., 29, 4; Grenf. and H., 2d ser., 25, 4; 35, 8).

οἰκοδόμησε: So in Bull. de corr. hell., XXVI (1902), p. 448, No. 8; **ἀνοικοδόμησεν** (Breccia, op. cit., 7, p. 51); but φιοδόμη[σ]εν (ib., 46, p. 31). Cf. **οἰκοδόμησαν** in Cagnat and Lafaye, Inscr. Gr. ad res Rom. pertinentes, III, 1127, 4; 1132, 5; 1143, 3; in the ind., p. 674, the authors add "in titulis saepissime". Mayser (Gram. d. gr. Pap. aus d. Ptolemäerzeit) notes three occurrences of failure to augment οι- to οι- or ο- in the perfect of this verb. Instead of **οἰκοδομεῖν** we generally find **ποιεῖν**, e. g., **ἰπέρ βασιλίσσης καὶ βασιλέως θεῶν μεγάλωι ε . . . οι** "Αλυπ[ος τὴν] προσευχὴν ἐποιεῖ Λιέ- μεχείρ (on a Jewish shrine stele from Gabbar; Wilamowitz, op. cit., p. 1094). The verb may even be entirely wanting, as in Strack, Dynastie d. Ptol., No. 167 (on a Jewish stele from Athribis).

l. 9: ζ on the stone appears as ξ.

Trans.: Papous erected (this) oratory in behalf of himself and of his wife and of his children. Year 4, Pharnouthi 7.

III. Funerary stele of white marble. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Length 0.272 m., breadth 0.215 m., thickness 0.029 m. Large portions of the upper left hand corner and lower right hand corner have been broken off. The inscription of three lines, however, is intact. It consists of shallowly cut capitals, the work of a professional hand, 0.035 m. in height; they incline to the uncial type, Ε being an excellent example. Epigraphical evidence would lead us to date the inscription in the second or third century A. D. (cf. Larfeld, Handb. d. gr. Epigr., II, pp. 487-501).

ΙΕΡΑΞ

ΑΠΟ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ

L ΝΒ ΕΥΦΥΧΙ

‘Ιέραξ | ἀπὸ Κλεοπατρίδος. | L (= ἐτῶν) νβ (= 52). Εὐφύ-
χ(ε)ι.

‘Ιέραξ: A very common Egyptian name; cf. Milne, op. cit., ind. of personal names, s. v.; Fox, Mummy-labels in the Royal Ontario Museum, AJP, xxxiv, 4, pp. 449–50.

ἀπό: As in the mummy-labels, an indication of nativity or of citizenship (Fox, op. cit., p. 442). It appears much more rarely on tombstones; e. g., Σουσάννα θυγάτηρ Ἀννα ἀπὸ Ἰσανρία (sic) (Lefebvre, Recueil des inscr. gr. d’Ég., 363).

Κλεοπατρίδος: I should be inclined to identify this place with the Cleopatris of Strabo 16, 4, 23: κατὰ Κλεοπατρίδα τὴν πρὸς τὴν παλαιὴ διώρυγι τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου, and 17, 1, 26: πλησίον δὲ τῆς Ἀρσινόης . . . καὶ ἡ Κλεοπατρὶς ἐν τῷ μιχῷ τοῦ Ἀραβίου κόλπου τῷ πρὸς Αἴγυπτον. Cf. 17, 1, 25: κατὰ πόλιν Ἀρσινόην ἦν οἱ Κλεοπατρίδα καλοῦσι.

If, however, Κλεοπατρὶς is a variant of Κλεοπάτρα (OGIS. III, n. 8), it may be identical with Κλεοπάτρα of OGIS. III, 12, or, more probably, with Κλεοπάτρα of the Hermopolite Nome. In nine papyri the name of the latter appears spelt in full (Mittéis, Gr. Urk. d. Papyrussamml. zu Leipzig, 18, 7–8; Preisigke, Gr. Pap. in Strassburg, 23, 13 a; Th. Reinach, Pap. gr. et dém. rec. en Ég., 10; 14; 16; 21; 22; 23; 31); twice the abbreviation Κλεοπ. is counted as standing for this name (Grenfell and Hunt, Amherst Pap., Gr., II, 126, 42; Wessely, Stud. z. Pal. und Papyrusk., Corp. Pap. Hermopol., pt. I, 127 F 1); the ethnic Κλεοπατρεύς is once recorded. The κρήνη Κλεοπατρ(ε)ιον mentioned in the Cat. of Pap. in Brit. Mus., III, 182, is hesitatingly located by the editor in Hermopolis.

Εὐφύχ(ε)ι: A spelling commonly found on Egyptian funerary stelae, as Milne, op. cit., 9226; 9250; 27532; 27565; 27630; Lefebvre, op. cit., 36. For ι = ε see Mayser, op. cit., pp. 87–88; Fox, op. cit., p. 439.

IV. Stele of brown sandstone, probably superimposed upon a lintel and perhaps dedicatory in character. From Deir el-Bahari in the Thebaïd. A regular rectangle 0.295 m. in height,

0.392 m. in breadth, and 0.077–0.13 m. in thickness. All four corners have suffered from abrasions. The stone is ornamented with an incised line which passes about the rectangle three or four cm. from the edge and thus forms a sort of frame. The upper third of the space within the frame is a plane surface bearing a Greek inscription of two lines. The lower two-thirds is a sunken rectangular panel adorned with sacred Christian symbols in relief. In the centre is a variant of the Christus-symbol \ddagger in which the Greek cross, two or three cm. in width, is presented in simple outline; the symbol is entirely surrounded by a wreath of palm leaves. The upper part of the space at the left of the wreath is occupied by an Λ , and the lower part by an “ankh” cross or *crux ansata* (Ω); the corresponding positions at the right are occupied by an Ω and another *crux ansata* whose circle was left unfinished by the stone-cutter. The workmanship of the stone, while much superior to that of our other inscriptions except No. I, is only fair. The letters of the text are about three cm. in height and are mixed square and *uncial*. All but three or four present no difficulties in reading.

ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ Ο ΒΟΗ . ΟΝ
ΤΩ ΜΟΝΑΣΤΗΡΙΩ ΑΜΗΝ

Eis θeōs ó βoη[θ]ōn | τō(ι) μoνaσtηriō(ι). 'Αμήn.

Eis βoηθōn: For the same phrase, its significance and spelling, see n. on VI. On the wall of the third terrace at Deir el-Bahari a graffito of allied nature has been discovered: **Eis θeōs ó βoηθōn ήμῶν** (= ήμῶν) (Lefebvre, op. cit., 379; Peer, Jour. Hell. Stud., XIX, 1899, pp. 14–19) followed by an “ankh” cross with palms; also one at Deir el-Chohada in the Convent of the Martyrs (Lefebvre, op. cit., 539); four on the walls of a Coptic monastery near Esnah in Southern Egypt (CIG, IV, 8946, 1–4); cf. ib., 9154 from the ruins of a Syrian monastery, and Lefebvre, op. cit., 415, on the funerary stele of an Egyptian monk.

Tō(ι) μoνaσtηriō(ι): The dative generally follows the foregoing phrase, but often the genitive, as in Lefebvre, op. cit., 379, quoted in the previous note. A close parallel is furnished by a Syrian inscription which my former colleague, Professor

David Magie, brought to my attention: ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ἀγ[ι]οῦ Σεργίου | κε Βάχου, εὐλόγεσσον τοῦ μονητοῦ(ηρίου). This inscription has since been edited in *Publ. Princeton Archaeol. Exped. Syria, Gr. and Lat. ISS, A*, where it appears as No. 722.

Αμήν: Exceedingly common in Crum, *Cat. gén. des ant. ég. du Mus. du Caire, Coptic Monuments*, and in Lefebvre, *op. cit.*

The symbols of the lower panel are of prime value in determining the age of this inscription. Lefebvre states (*op. cit.*, p. xxxii) that inscriptions bearing Α and Ω may possibly belong to the fourth century, but probably belong to a later one. There is nothing certain in regard to the age of the sign + except that it is younger than ✕ (and ✕), which are apparently to be assigned to the fourth century (*p. xxxiv*). The indications are, therefore, that an inscription marked by this sign originated during the fifth or a subsequent century. The *crux ansata* is a very ancient pre-Christian symbol found commonly in Egypt and other oriental lands. It was early appropriated by the Christians along with its pagan meaning of "life". None of the many attempts to explain the symbolism of the constituent parts can be regarded as conclusive (Seymour, *The Cross in Tradition, History and Art*, pp. 3-5; 7; 16-17; 21; 188; Zöckler, *The Cross of Christ*, pp. 2 ff.; 156; 379 ff.; cf. Flinders Petrie, *Eg. Decor. Art*, p. 117).

The name Deir el-Bahari means "The Northern Monastery", although at present no monastery exists on the site. But as "deir" may be applied also to a place where such a building once stood (Somers Clarke, *Christian Ant. in the Nile Valley*, p. 192), it is quite properly used in this instance, for in the early part of the Christian era a monastery was erected here on the ruins of the old dynastic temple of Hatshepsut (see Naville, Hall, Currelly, *The XIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari*, pt. iii, p. 20). Hall (*ib.*, p. 13) without qualification identifies this as the Coptic monastery of St. Phoebammon. Amélineau (*La Géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque copte*, p. 128), on the other hand, merely conjectures this identification. The documentary evidence at his disposal seems to justify his conclusion (cf. Crum, *op. cit.*, 8728-8741). If it is correct, this old monastery sheltered a large community of monks, for we are told that it had a superior and at least one steward, and perhaps two. It enjoyed marked distinc-

tion in the surrounding region through the fame of its patron Phoebammon, bishop of Aousim (Amélineau, *op. cit.*, p. 129). How late the building stood is not recorded. At all events, no document dating later than the eighth century has been recovered from the heaps of rubbish thrown out by the monks (Naville, Hall, Currely, *op. cit.*, p. 21). Clarke (*op. cit.*, p. 190) notes that some remains of the monastery "encrusted" the temple of Hatshepsut during the incumbency of a recent director-general of antiquities, and holds this official responsible for their destruction and for failure to secure beforehand plans and records of them.

There is no evidence offered by the chief authorities (Butler, *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*; Clarke, *op. cit.*,) on Coptic ecclesiastical procedure that it was the custom to lay a stone of dedication in erecting a church or monastery. But in the consecration of an altar three dedicatory stones were used, each bearing the name of one of the three patron saints of the building (Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 192). The stone now being edited is therefore not an altar stone, and we are probably safe in inferring from the silence of the authorities that it is not a stone of dedication of the building as a whole. The fact (see No. VI, n.) that in Syria the phrase *εἰς θεός* (as well as its amplifications) appears most frequently over lintels suggests that this stone occupied some such position in the monastery of Deir el-Bahari. A funerary stele (Lefebvre, *op. cit.*, 364) from Thebes, in the environs of which our inscription originated, is constructed in the form of the portal of a church and is inscribed with the sacred phrase. The association of the words with an entrance was therefore known in this locality. It is not improbable that a lintel thus inscribed had some secondary connection with the dedication of a building. The dimensions of the Toronto stone are such as to induce one to infer that it was incorporated into the original walls of the monastery and was not an appliqué of later date.

No conclusive evidence is available for identifying and dating St. Phoebammon. He may be the man of that name mentioned in the 143rd epistle of Synesius. The life of the latter extended from about 370 to 415 A. D. (Schneider, *De Vita Syn. Philosophi et Episcopi*, diss., Leipzig, 1876, pp. 9. 41 ff.). The epistle to which we have alluded was written

during the last few years of his life and at that time Phoebammon¹ was still living. This date approximates that deduced in the examination of the chronological indications of the symbols on the stone. An object, we observed, bearing the symbol ♀ can scarcely be older than the fifth century. This stone may possibly be more recent in its origin, but the fair degree of excellence in the execution of its adornments argues against such a supposition.

V. Funerary stele of limestone. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Height 0.573 m.; width 0.47 m.; thickness 0.077 m. The stele is rectangular and on it is represented a distyle portico with an angular pediment surmounted by acroteria. The two columns have the so-called papyrus capitals. The entire breadth of the lower part of the area between the columns is occupied by a couch on which a male figure is reclining on his left side. His left elbow rests on two cushions and his head is turned so as to face the observer. He is clad in chiton and himation, below which appear his unsandaled feet. In his extended right hand he is holding a cyathus before a jackal. The animal is lying on a bracket or corbel projecting from the background and faces the front. The whole work is in moderately high relief. The nose of the man and that of the jackal have been badly mutilated. The cyathus, originally represented in relief on the bracket, has almost entirely vanished. The workmanship throughout is very crude.

On the horizontal panel between the legs of the couch are sketched in roughly incised outline four domestic utensils of the Roman period. Enumerating from right to left these are: a bowl with a high foot, an amphora with a pointed base supported on a tripod, a three-legged pot with a sparingly ornamented body, and, lastly, another bowl.

Illustrations and descriptions of very similar monuments may be seen in Milne, op. cit., 9258 (pl. viii); 9251 and 9256 (pl. ix). The chief variable in this type of sculpture is the figure of the jackal. As a rule it rests on a bracket attached to one of the pillars. Often two jackals appear one on each side of the portico. This animal had an important religious

¹ An undated Coptic tombstone (No. 10. 176. 40) in the Metr. Mus. in New York, bears the name Φοιβάμ(μ)ων.

significance for the Egyptian, who believed that a soul on leaving the dead body had to pass through the great wilderness before it could reach the oasis-kingdom of Osiris. "The jackal's omniscience as to where any dead body is hidden, his wail in the night as if for lost souls, his certainty of direction out in the limitless, trackless, demonic desert, and the fact that though his home is the desert, yet he is never far from an oasis, made this animal the best possible symbol of a guide for the dead." (The Sacred Ibis Cemetery and Jackal Catacombs at Abydos, The Nat. Geog. Magazine, XXIV (1913), 9, pp. 1048-1050.)

On the horizontal panel below the portico is an inscription of four lines. Only the first two are at all difficult to read and they were apparently inscribed after the last two which identify the remains marked by the stone. At all events they were cut by another and less skilful hand. In view of this and of the uncertainty conveyed by the ω s ($\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$) as to the exact age of the defunct, we may conclude: either that his exact age was unknown, or that, in the daily expectation of his death, friends prepared and inscribed the stone with all particulars but the date of decease. Below the two lines of the first hand are scored deep guide-lines. The epigraphical indications point to the first or second century as the period to which this monument belongs. The letters approximate the uncial of the manuscripts more nearly than those of No. III.

Ε . Ο . Κ Κ

Χ Ο Ι Α Κ $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$

ΠΤΟΛΛΙΩΝ ΣΥΑΝΓ. ΛΟΥ ΙΜ. . Ι Ο

ΠΩΛΗΣ ΣΥCΕΒΗΣ ΩC LL ΠΤΒ

"Ε[τ]ο[ν]ς κ' | , Χοίακ κε. | Πτολλίων Εύαργ[έ]λον
ιμ[ατ]ιο | πώλης, εύσεβης. ως LL (=ετών) πβ (=82).

Πτολλίων: An Egyptian name recorded in a few places only: e. g., Grenfell and Hunt, Ox. Pap., I, 72; 137; II, 274; IV, 492; Mitteis, op. cit., 104 (Πτολίων); Cat. of Gr. Pap. in Brit. Mus., II, ind.; Aeg. Urk., gr. Urk., I, 68 (Πτολλείων).

Εύαργ[έ]λον: A good Greek name attested as early as the sixth century B. C. (see Kirchner, Pros. Att., and Pape, Gr.

Eigenn., s. v.). This origin of the name and the pagan symbolism of the monument proves that the use of the name here is not due to Christian influences. For other records of the name in Egypt see Aeg. Urk., gr. Urk., II, III, IV, ind., and Grenfell and Hunt, Ox. Pap., VI, 989, where the correct spelling is observed throughout. Of the use of -*vy*- for -*yy*- in cognate words abundant parallels are to be had by consulting the index of the works of Prentice, and of Cagnat and Lafaye, already noted, and also of Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris, 1904).

ιμ[ατ]ισπάλης: So in a mummy-label in Cairo (Milne, op. cit., 9311). Whether *ο* or *ω* is to be read before *π* is not clear on the stone.

εὐσεβής: Cf. *Δουπ<π>ιανὴ ἄωρος φιλάδελφος εὐσεβής*, ὡς ἐτῶν L (sic) κδ', ἐτους κβ', 'Αθνρ κβ' (Milne, op. cit., 9226).

LL: Usually a single L suffices for both *ἐτους* and *ἐτῶν*.

Trans.: Year 20, Choiak 25. Ptollion (son) of Evangelus, clothing merchant, (died) in the faith at about the age of eighty-two.

VI. Greek-Coptic funerary stele of limestone. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown, but probably from the Fayûm to which district Lefebvre (op. cit., p. xxvii) attributes all Christian inscriptions on limestone. Height, 0.337 m.; width, 0.266 m.; thickness, 0.046 m. The stele is a perfect rectangle except for the loss of a small part of the upper right hand corner. A cross *fleury* in shallow intaglio outlines almost covers the surface of the stone symmetrically. The bar and pale of the cross, which are almost uniformly 0.029 m. in width, intersect one another approximately at their medial points. A semicircle of the same width unites the ends of the bar with the top end of the pale. From each side of the semicircle a half-opened leaf-bud rises towards the corner of the stone nearest to it. From the under sides of the semicircle hang two fully-opened vine leaves on long sinuous stems. Below the bar is a Greek-Coptic inscription of three lines, the letters of which show marked uncial characteristics. Below this again are illegible traces of another inscription of equal length. Inasmuch as the text now legible is complete in itself it seems probable that the stone was originally erected to mark the grave of some other personage than the Petros

noted here, and that this man or his friends appropriated the stone, erased the original legend, and inscribed the present one.

Ε Ι Κ Θ .
Η Θ Ν +
Π Ε Τ Π Ο Β

Ο Κ Ο Β Ο
Π Η Ν Ε Μ
Ε Τ Ο Β Α Α Β

Ἐλς θ[ε]ὸς ὁ βο | ηθὸν Χρ(ιστός). ΗΝΕ Μ | ΠΕΤΡΟΥ
ΕΤΟΒΑΑΒ.

Ἐλς Βοηθὸν: Cf. No. IV. Θεὸς either alone or with μόνος or δ βοηθῶν is very common in the Egyptian compilations of Crum and of Lefebvre. Prentice (op. cit.) records it often in Syrian inscriptions and explains (pp. 51 ff.) that although it is of Jewish origin it is Christian in its sphere of usage. It seems to be a transcript of a portion of Deut. VI, 4, and in accordance with the prescription of v. 9 of the same chapter is generally found inscribed over entrance doors. In Syria the formula is observed throughout a period ranging from 326 to 537 A. D.

Βοηθὸν: For this spelling see Crum (op. cit.) and Lefebvre (op. cit.) passim. ο for ω in vulgar inscriptions from Egypt is one of the commonest faults of orthography which go to make up "cetamas de bizarries qui s'expliquent plus par le caprice et l'ignorance individuelle, que par les lois naturelles d'une langue en voie de transformation" (Lefebvre, op. cit., p. xxxviii). Cf. Mayser, op. cit., p. 98.

+Ρ = Χρ(ιστός): The loop of the ρ has disappeared through a chipping off of the stone, but the reading is made certain by comparing it with the very similar text of an unpublished Greek-Coptic inscription (No. 10. 176. 24) in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

HNΕ: Professor R. D. Wilson of the Princeton Theological Seminary writes me that this word (HNH, in the Metropolitan inscription just referred to) is a corruption of ΕΙΝΕ (= Abbild, Gestalt, in Steindorff, Kopt. Gram., p. 68*, s. v.), which is probably identical with INI of Deut. IV, 32 (= Hebr. **בָּן** and LXX. **γλυπτόν**) and connected with the Egyptian **𓁴** = 'in. The word occurs nowhere in Crum, op. cit. Ordinarily the Coptic uses one or other of the Greek loan-words **CTHΛΗ** and **MNHΜΕΙΟΝ**, if the word for monument is required at all.

ΜΤΕΤΡΟV: **Μ** = **Ν**, the particle uniting the nomen rectum and the nomen regens (Steindorff, op. cit., pp. 21, 70). The genitive idea involved here accounts for the employment of the Greek genitive ending of ΤΤΕΤΡΟV. This name is noted also in Crum, op. cit., 8670.

ΕΤΟΒΑΑB: = ΕΤ + ΟΒΑΑB, i. e., the relative particle (Steindorff, op. cit., p. 203) plus the participle of the infinitive ΟΒΟΤΤ, "rein, heilig werden" (pp. 93; 83*). The expression is counted only three times in Crum's Coptic Mon.; **Ἐτοι θεὸς δὲ βοηθῶν ΣΟΦΙΑ ΤΜΟΝΟΧΗ ΤΤΙΑΡΘΕΝΟC ΕΤΟΒΑΑB ΑΜHN** (8651); also 8492; 8578; and once in an unpublished inscription (No. 10. 176. 37) in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

The entire Coptic phrase signifies: The stele of Peter who is pure (i. e., probably, celibate).

"The cross *fleurly* is the earliest variation of the cross. It appears on coins of the Emperor Justinian" (Seymour, op. cit., p. 367). The full-blown petals at the ends of the bar and of the pale symbolize the mature Christian life. The budding and the unfolded leaves tell much the same story, but emphasize the progress towards this maturity rather than the attainment itself. This inscription bearing as it does this type of cross cannot well be older than the middle of the sixth century.

VII. Iron knife from the Fayūm. Blade and handle-band of one piece 0.275 m. long; blade alone c. 0.067 m. wide. The metal is badly rusted. Cylindrical handle of wood 0.121 m. long; c. 0.056 m. in diameter. Around the handle are scored a number of parallel rings. The name + ΑΤΕ is incised on the

left side of the blade. No similarly inscribed knife is listed by Milne (op. cit., pp. 105 ff.) among the many Egyptian domestic objects preserved in the Museum of Cairo.

Ψάτε: A Greek-Coptic name found in a few late documents; e. g., Cat. of Gr. Pap. in the Brit. Mus., IV (=Aphrodito Pap.), 1460, 101; 1553, verso 25; Crum, op. cit., 8212; 8268; 8270; 8276.

A common variant is **Ψότε**, as Aphrod. Pap., 1419, 197, 1274; 1457, II. **Ψότ** and **Ψότ** appear as abbreviations (ib., 1491 d; 1460, 176). **Ψότι** (Reich, Dem. und gr. Texte auf Mumientäfelchen in d. Samml. d. Pap. Erzherzog Rainer, Gr. 4), and **Ψάτης** (Lefebvre, op. cit., 266) seem to be a Demotic and a Hellenized variant respectively.

VIII. Votive inscription of the type of **προσκύνημα**, or supplication, on a layer of a crystal of gypsum. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Originally a rectangle, but now an irregular quadrilateral figure owing to the loss of a portion of the top and of one side. Perpendicular height, 0.061 m.; width, 0.59 m.; thickness, 0.003 m. Inasmuch as the crystal is snow-white and as the letters are lightly incised, the resulting lack of contrast makes the inscription unusually hard to read. The two surfaces are written upon, but each by a different hand and in the free cursive style of the first century A. D.

A

Only one line, or, at the most, two lines, have been lost at the top, and only several letters at the right.

[τὸ προσκύνημα]
[ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ]
1. [τῆς γυν] αικ[ὸς
καὶ τῶν φίλω[ν
μον καὶ Ἀρνω
τον. γέγραφ[α
ταῦτα
5. — i Νέρων[ος τοῦ
κυρίου Με[χεὶρ οΓ Μεσορὴ
μ[ηνός . . .

For the best examples of this type of inscription beginning with the words **τὸ προσκύνημα**, see CIG, III, 4985 ff., *passim*.

Cf. Bull. de corr. hell., XXVI (1902), pp. 442-3, Nos. 2, 3. To know the name of the deity in whose shrine this crystal and No. IX were picked up would materially assist in the restoration of the text.

[αὐτοῦ] : = ἐμαυτοῦ, as often in this department.

Ἄρνωτον : = Ἀρνώτον. Spiegelberg, Aeg. und gr. Eigenn. aus Mumienetiketten, p. 6*, states that the name means "Horus ist gesund"; cf. Fox, op. cit., p. 446. The rough breathing was written here as '.

γέγραφα: So in CIG, 333, 4742; often ἔγραψα, ἐπόησα, πεπόηκα.

Λ : = ἔτρος.

Trans.: Supplication in behalf of myself and of my wife and of my friends and of Haryotes. I have written this in the tenth year of our Lord Nero, in the month Mecheir (or Mesore) (= Jan.-Feb. or July-Aug., 64 A. D.).

B

One or two lines are missing at the beginning and a few syllables at the left side. The right is practically intact.

[τὸ προσκύνημα]

1.]ο[καὶ]
 τοῦ νιοῦ α[ν
 το]ῦ καὶ τοῦ
 αὐ]τοῦ πάντω
 5. ν. Λ $\frac{1}{i} \beta$ Νέρων
 τοῦ] κυρίου,
 Παχ]ῶν $\bar{\omega}$

5: The stroke above the figure $\bar{\omega}$ is plainly continued unbroken from the left. This naturally prompts one to supply another figure. As A was inscribed in the tenth year of Nero, the interval between the two compositions on the one object would be too long were any other figure than $\bar{\omega}$ supplied.

Trans.: Supplication of (or, in behalf of) and of his son and of all his household. Year twelve of our Lord Nero, Pachon 14 (= May 9, 66 A. D.).

IX. Similar to No. VIII. A parallelogram; perpendicular height, 0.057 m.; width, 0.045 m.; thickness, c. 0.002 m. The writing is of the same type and period as that on No. VIII, but is much fainter and more poorly executed. Not more than a dozen letters can be deciphered with certainty. Any restoration, therefore, must be regarded as tentative. The indications point to a longer and more complex formula than those of No. VIII. With the restoration appended hereto cf. *en bloc* CIG, III, 4986 ff.

[τὸ προσκύνημα praenominis]

1.]λιον λουπο[
]π[α]ρα τη(ι) κυρι[α(ι)]
[nomini deae ὑπὲρ τῆς γυ]ν[αικ]ὸς καὶ^{τῆς θν]}υατρὸς καὶ τῶ[ν
5. φίλων πάν]των μον[καὶ^{Δ]}ημητρί[ον . Λ . .]
Νέρω]νος τοῦ κυ[ρίον,
κῆ] [Πα]χ[ών, or Με]χ[είρ.

]λιον λουπο[: Probably a nomen and a cognomen like Cornelius Lupus in the genitive.

παρά: Cf. CIG, III, 4839; 4897; 4902.

μον: Cf. CIG, III, 4996.

κῆ: The letter read here as κ resembles λ on the crystal, but that is of course impossible either as a day of the month or as a year of Nero's reign. We assume that the number of the year preceded the emperor's name as on both faces of No. VIII. The year in this case can hardly be far from the tenth and twelfth of Nero's reign.

W. SHERWOOD FOX.

WESTERN UNIVERSITY, LONDON, CANADA.

V.—REDUPLICATION IN TAGALOG.

Reduplication is a common linguistic phenomenon, consisting of the repetition of the whole or part of a word, which is found to a certain extent in probably all languages. In many it has failed to be adopted as a part of the machinery or grammar of the language, and is of little or no importance; in others it has become a part of the bone and sinew of the language, and has given rise to many important categories. Nowhere, perhaps, is this linguistic principle more productive of results than in the Philippine languages, and here it probably finds its highest development in Tagalog, the most important language of the archipelago.

Reduplication in Tagalog may be of one or more syllables, and it may be at the beginning or end of a word. The final consonant of a syllable that is reduplicated is not repeated unless it is the final consonant of a word or root.

With regard to form the following are the principal varieties of reduplication, viz.,

1) monosyllabic, where a single syllable is reduplicated to form a root, e. g., *ol'ol* 'mad'.¹

2) partial, where one syllable near the beginning of a word is reduplicated, the syllable being either the first syllable of a root or one of the syllables of a prefix, e. g.,

susúlat from *súlat* 'write'.

magkaka-útang from *magka-útang* 'owe'.

magigin-banál from *magin-banál* 'become good'.

3) full, in which the first two syllables of a word or root are repeated, e. g.,

araw'áraw from *áraw* 'day'.

sangposangpówo from *sangpówo* 'ten'.

¹ In the various Spanish grammars the accent marks are used to denote both the tonic syllable and the final glottal catch, but without

4) combined partial and full, e. g.,

iisaisá from *isá* 'one'.

babalibaligtád from *baligtád* 'turn'.

5) reduplication of the final syllable, e. g.,

bulaklák 'flower' from **bulak*.

himaymáy 'separate meat from bones' from *himay* (same).

6) final reduplication which consists in adding at the end of a dissyllabic word a syllable consisting of the initial consonant of the first syllable and the vowel and final consonant of the last syllable, e. g.,

kaliskís 'scale (of fish)' from *kalís* 'to scrape'.

Reduplication may be either significant or non-significant, i. e., non-significant in the sense that its significance is not apparent, or that no special semantic category arises from the reduplication, though in every case there was doubtless a reason for the reduplication.

Classes (1), (5) and (6) are always non-significant; partial reduplication (2) is non-significant in the following cases, viz.,

a) in certain nouns simple and derivative, e. g.,

laláki 'man'.¹

babáyi 'woman'.

masasaktín 'sickly'.

inaamá 'god-father'.

b) in the numerals:

daławá (*<*dadawa*) 'two'.²

tatló 'three'.

uniformity or consistency. The following system based partly on their usage is here employed, viz.,

á = accent on either penult or ultima.

à = glottal catch on final unaccented vowel.

â = accented final vowel with glottal catch.

¹ Here, for instance, the reduplication may be used to emphasize the strength or size of the male (*lakí* means 'greatness, size'). The following word *babáyi* 'woman' may owe its reduplication to analogy with this word.

² Here the reduplication may be due to the idea of doubling and in the following word it may be analogical.

c) in roots of the *magkan* verbal class, which indicates 'to emit from body voluntarily', e. g.,

magkanluluhà 'to weep (modal)'.

Significant reduplication, generally speaking, emphasizes or strengthens in some way the meaning of the simple word. The various significant uses of reduplication are the following.

Partial reduplication (2) indicates emphasis, intensiveness, or plurality in the following cases, viz.:

a) adjectives with prefixed *ma* form their plural thus, e. g., *mabubúti* from *mabúti* 'good'.

b) adjectives of equality denoting 'as much of the quality as', take this form of reduplication when more than two individuals are compared, e. g., *magkalakí*, *singlakí*, *magkasinglakí* 'as large as'; *magkakalakí*, *singlalakí*, *magkakasinglakí*, 'equally large'.

c) the words *kauntí* 'a little', *muntí* 'a little, small', make the forms *kakauntí*, *mumuntí*, which are usually employed as plurals.

d) nouns of relationship with prefixed *mag*, e. g., *magamá* 'father and child' take this form of reduplication to denote a group of three or more, e. g., *magaamá* 'father and children'.

e) the exclamatory expressions formed of abstract noun + genitive with the meaning of how + predicate adjective + subject, e. g., *búti niyá* 'how beautiful she is!' (literally 'beauty of her !') may have their meaning intensified by this form of reduplication, which is used especially when the genitive is plural, e. g., *bubúti niyá* 'how beautiful she is !!' *bubúti nilá* 'how beautiful they are !!'

f) with numerals and names of pieces of money this reduplication emphasizes the meaning of the numerals in a restrictive sense, e. g., *iisá* 'only one' from *isá* 'one', *titiglawá* 'only two apiece' from *tiglawá* 'two apiece', *mimínsan* 'only once' from *mínsan* 'once', *pipíso* 'only one peso' from *piso* 'peso'.

g) a similar restrictive reduplication is found in nouns of individuality with prefixed *ka*, e. g., *katáwo* 'one man', *kaka-táwo* 'one man only'.

h) in the regular verbal forms this kind of reduplication indicates intensity in time, e. g., from the root *larô* 'play' we have

naglalarô present from *naglarô* preterite, and *maglalarô* future from *maglarô* modal; the same reduplication is found in most verbal nouns of action, e. g., *paglalarô* 'act of playing'.

i) intensive active imperatives are formed by prefixing *ka* to the partially reduplicated root, e. g., *kalalákad* 'go quickly'.

j) the same formation as in (i) is used as a passive verbal form in the sense of 'to have just', e. g., *kaaalís niyá* 'he has just gone' from *alis* 'go'.

k) the oblique case of the article, *sa*, followed by a partially reduplicated noun or root is said to indicate that something has been done which is displeasing to the speaker, e. g., *sa titíngin ka* 'you kept on looking : ' here the force of the reduplication is probably to emphasize the incontrovertibility of the statement as in 'you did, you know you did, you needn't deny it'.

In (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) the reduplication usually denotes plurality, though at times it intensifies some idea other than number; in (f), (g) it emphasizes the idea of individuality or number; in (h), (i), (j) it indicates additional vividness in time relations; in (k) it emphasizes the incontrovertibility of the statement.

Partial reduplication (2) denotes distribution in,

a) the distributive numerals with prefixed *tig* from 'five' upward, e. g., *tiglilimá* 'five each' from *limá* 'five'.

b) nouns derived from names of money with the suffix *in*, e. g., *sasalapiin* 'having value of a *salapi* each', from *salapi* 'half-peso'.

c) *magkakanó* 'how much apiece' from *magkanó* 'how much'.

d) perhaps in cardinal numeral adverbs above 'five', e. g., *makalimá* or *makalilimá* 'five times' from *limá* 'five'; the reduplicated forms probably meant originally 'five several times', etc.

Full reduplication (3) indicates emphasis, intensiveness or plurality in the following cases, viz.:

a) the pronoun of the third person plural may take this reduplication, e. g., *silasilá*, *kanikanilá*, as well as *silá*, *kanilá*.

b) the plural of interrogative pronouns is made in the same way, e. g., *sinosino*, from *sino* 'who', *alinalín* from *alín* 'which', *anoanó* from *anó* 'what'.

c) a general intensive idea is given by full reduplication of the root either in root or derivative abstract nouns, e. g., *mulamulâ* 'the very beginning', *karunungrunún̄gan* 'knowledge', *pakábutibútî* 'beauty' (in exclamations).

d) adjectives indicating qualities that affect the mind are made by prefixing *ka* to the fully reduplicated root, e. g., *kaibigibig* 'lovable'.

e) the superlative of adjectives is in form at least an abstract noun with fully reduplicated root, e. g., *katam'istam'isan* 'sweetest' from *ma-tam'is* 'sweet'.

f) certain adverbs have their meaning emphasized by this form of reduplication, e. g., *kangikanǵina* 'just a moment ago', *sa magkabikabilâ* 'from all sides'.

g) verbs made on the basis of fully reduplicated roots may have an intensive meaning, e. g., *magkasirasirâ* 'to be completely destroyed'.

h) the particle *ka* prefixed to fully reduplicated verbal roots or passive stems imparts the idea of 'as soon as', e. g., *katakbotakbó niyá* 'as soon as he began to run'.

In (b) the reduplication usually, though not necessarily, indicates the plural, in (c) the nouns are often used in connection with a plural genitive, in (h) it denotes additional vividness in time relations, in (e) it indicates the superlative, otherwise it is simply intensive.

Full reduplication denotes distribution in the following cases, viz.:

a) with root nouns it has the force of 'every', e. g., *ta-wotáwo* 'every man', *araw'áraw* 'every day'.

b) the numerals *tigatló*, *tigápat*, 'three apiece', 'four apiece', have also the reduplicated forms *tigatigatló*, *tigatigápat*.

c) regular series of distributive numerals meaning 'so many at a time', and 'every so many' are derived from the cardinal and ordinal numerals respectively, e. g., *daladalawá* 'two by two', from *dalawá* 'two', *ikaikatló* 'every third' from *ikatló*.

d) in certain adverbs, e. g., *unti'unti* 'little by little'.

Occasionally this form of reduplication has the force of 'various' or 'some', e. g., *bagaybagáy* 'things of various kinds', *maminsanminsan* 'sometimes'.

This form of reduplication has also developed a peculiar diminutive force in the following, viz.:

- a) in nouns with suffix *an*, e. g., *tawotawóhan* 'manikin' from *táwo* 'man'.
- b) in adjectives with prefix *ma*, e. g., *mabutibúti* 'somewhat good, pretty good' from *mabúti* 'good'.
- c) in verbs, e. g., *sumusulatsúlat* 'he writes a little' from *sumusúlat* 'he writes'; these diminutive verbal forms are said to differ from the emphatic reduplicated verbal forms like *magkasirasírā* 'to be completely destroyed' (cf. above, p. 429) in their intonation.

Combined reduplication (4) regularly indicates a greater degree of restriction than that implied by (2) in

- a) restrictive numerals and names of money, e. g., *iisaisá* 'one only' from *iisá*, *pipisopíso* 'only a single *piso*', from *pipíso*.

- b) nouns of individuality with prefixed *ka*, e. g., *kakataká-táwo* 'one man only' from *katáwo*.

Various combinations of the different kinds of reduplication also occur in which each kind has its own special force, e. g., *natotoyotoyó* present of *matoyotoyó* 'be very dry', where we have partial reduplication indicating the present, with intensive full reduplication, etc.

The most original form of reduplication in Tagalog seems to have been the repetition of a monosyllabic or a dissyllabic root. This combination had originally two meanings, one intensive as in *mulamulá* 'the very beginning' from *mulá* 'root, beginning', and the other extensive, e. g., *tawotáwo* 'one man, another man (and so on)', i. e., 'every man'.¹ Partial reduplication either at the beginning or end of a word is probably to be regarded as originally a substitute for full reduplication. From these simple beginnings, through the influence of analogy, the complicated system which has just been outlined has been developed. From intensive reduplication are derived all forms that denote simple emphasis, plurality, the superlative, additional vividness in time relations, and restriction;

¹ Evidences of this double meaning of reduplication are found also in Semitic; cf. my article, *The Expression of Indefinite Pronominal Ideas in Hebrew*, *Journal of American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXXIV, parts I and II (1914), p. 140, n. 3.

from extensive reduplication, all forms that denote distribution, whether it has the meaning of 'so many at a time', 'so many to each', 'every so many', 'of various sorts', 'some'. Reduplication that has a diminutive force is perhaps derived from the intensive reduplication of some word denoting 'little' or the like, e. g., *mumunti*, from which it was extended to other words with the diminutive force still adhering to it.¹

FRANK R. BLAKE.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

¹ Reduplication with a similar diminutive force is occasionally found in Sanskrit adjectives, e. g., *kṣāmakṣāma* 'rather thin' from *kṣāma* 'thin' (cf. Speier, Sanskrit Syntax, Leyden, 1886, p. 191); and also in certain color words in Hebrew, e. g., *adadamat* 'reddish' from *adom* 'red' (cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, 2d Eng. ed., p. 235, § 84, n).

VI.—SLAVIC *togo*.

In a recent article, Mém. Soc. Ling. XIX 115 ff., Meillet deals with the pronunciation of the Russian pronominal ending -*to* (*togo*, *kogo*, *čego*, *dobrago*, etc.) as -*vo*, in which *v* is clearly substituted for *γ*. He refutes Fortunatov's view, according to which Sl. *togo* comes from I. E. **toyo* (**tojo*) = Gr. *τόο*, *τοῦ* (Homeric *τοίο*), and derives *tavó* < **toyó* from a form with I. E. *gh*, following the traditional view in this respect. The intervocalic voiced stop *g* in *togo* became a spirant, *γ*, on account of the frequent unemphatic use of *mots accessoires* like *togo*. But since the voiced velar spirant otherwise hardly occurs in (standard) Russian, the more familiar labio-dental spirant *v* was substituted for it. Concerning this substitution, there can be no doubt, either as to the fact itself, or as to the reason for it. The change *g*>*γ* is more doubtful. Theoretically, it is, of course, quite possible; but there are no reliable parallels to be found in Great Russian, with the exception of the southern dialects, where this change is common. The spirantic pronunciation of *g* in *boga* is due to the church language, in which southern influence prevails to an extent, while *γ* in *togda*, *kogda* is due either to the association with *togo*, *kogo*, or to dissimilation in the unusual sound combination *gd*—probably both factors have contributed. No such reasons are imaginable for the ending -*go*. Form words of the kind of *togo* are not likely to introduce a foreign sound into the language; on the other hand, they are now and then found to preserve older pronunciations under conditions such as I outlined JEGPh. XVI 5 f.; thus, *d* was retained instead of the newer *t* in Gothic *du*, *dis-*, *g* for *k* in Runic *haitega*, *t* for *z* in Middle Franconian *that*, *it*, *wat*, *allet*. It is most likely that the spirant in the Russian forms in question presents a similar inhibited development, namely a primitive Slavic *γ*, which fell together with Sl. *g*< I. E. *g* or *gh* in all other Slavic languages, but retained its spirantic

character in Russian under conditions exactly analogous to those of MFr. *that*, etc. In other words, I consider the Russian pronominal genitives in *-go* = *-vo* as *Restwörter* (cp. Hermann, KZ. XXXIX 609), in which a phonetic change that affected all of the rest of the language was not carried thru. If so, the present pronunciation of *boga* was introduced while *togo* was pronounced *tøyó*; the unusual velar spirant was retained in the church word, but replaced by familiar *v* in the form words.

But what was the origin of that *γ*? It seems chronologically improbable that it preserved a prehistoric difference between I. E. *g* and *gh*, which fell together in primitive Slavic times. Still, this would have to be assumed if we accept the traditional explanation dating back to Miklosich, that Sl. *-go* represents an I. E. particle **gho* = Skr. *gha*. Fortunatov, BB. XX 182 doubts this explanation, and also Berneker, KZ. XXXVII 374 believes "dass die Erklärung von *-go* als Partikel gleich ai. *gha* ihre Bedenken hat". But Meillet, *Du genre animé en vieux-slave*, p. 114 ff. (with Jagić, ASPh. I 440) explains *togo* as an ablative, I. E. **tōd* = Lith. *tō*, Skr. *tāt*, combined with the particle **gho*; Sl. **ta-go* became *togo* under the influence of forms like *tomu*.

A different explanation of these forms had been briefly suggested by the writer, AJPh. XXXII 435. *s* changes to *ch* in Slavic under conditions that, it is true, are not fully understood (chiefly after *i, u, r, k*, but also after other sounds; cp. Vondrák, Sl. Gr. II 90; Leskien, Altbulg. Elb. 29 f.). According to my above-mentioned article (*A Slavic Analogy to Verner's Law*) and according to Zupitza KZ. XXXVII 369 and Uhlenbeck KZ. XXXIX 599, Sl. *s* is inclined to become *z* when the accent follows. It is natural to assume that we might find *γ* for *z* (the velar spirant for the dental sibilant) under conditions similar to those where *ch* stands for *s*. As a matter of fact, I was able to quote (l. c.) a number of correspondences of *s* and *g*, like *drusati* 'shake' : *drūgati* 'tremble', *bogū* 'god' : *bēsū* 'demon'. Thus, the Slavic pronominal genitives in *-go* are clearly to be explained as developments from I. E. forms in *-so* : **to-so*, etc.; *s* became *ch* as in many other words (cp. *tēchū*), and this was voiced when the accent followed. This belief is strengthened by the fact that geni-

tive forms with *s* actually occur in Balto-Slavic: OPruss. *s-tesse*, Sl. interrogative *česo* < I. E. **qe-so* = Goth. *hwis*; Russian *kogo* is a transfer from *togo* both as to the stem vowel and the consonant of the ending, and the neuter *čego* has levelled its consonant according to all other pronominal forms of its kind. Sl. *togo*: *česo* represent accentual differences, I. E. **to-só*: **qé-so*.

E. PROKOSCH.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra. Edited with a translation and notes and an introduction, together with the text and translation of Bāṇa's *Candīśataka*, by **GEORGE PAYN QUACKENBOS**, A. M., Ph. D., Instructor in Latin in the College of the City of New York. New York, Columbia University Press, 1917. (Volume 9 of Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, edited by A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages in Columbia University.)

Dr. Quackenbos has collected within the covers of this volume all of the extant writings which are with certainty or likelihood attributed to the Sanskrit poet Mayūra, and has added thereto the *Candīśataka* of Bāṇa, which tradition says was a rival composition to Mayūra's *Sūryaśataka*. He has also collected, in his elaborate introduction, all the references which he was able to find in Indian literature or inscriptions to this Mayūra, or to any other person of the name. On the basis of a careful and judicious weighing of these references, he has attempted to reconstruct as much of the life of the poet as can be reconstructed with plausibility. As is unhappily the case with most even of the greatest figures in Indian literary history, the references to Mayūra are all mixt up with obviously legendary stuff, so that there is really nothing that can be said to be known, with absolute certainty, about his life. Our editor seems justified, however, in accepting the tradition that he was the contemporary—probably the rival, and perhaps the father-in-law—of the poet Bāṇa, and like him a protégé of the famous King Harṣa. If this tradition is true, Mayūra must have flourished in the first half of the seventh century A. D. Less certain appears to be the story that he was a *jāṅgulika*, 'snake-doctor', by profession. He was very likely a Sāura or adherent of sun-worship; almost certainly not a Jaina or a Buddhist.

The tradition that Mayūra was a leper, while very likely a myth, is interesting because of the way in which legend connects it with his two principal compositions. It is said that Mayūra composed a poem of eight stanzas in which he described, in very lascivious language, the charms of his own daughter, Bāṇa's wife. The lady was so enraged when she

heard the poem that she curst her father with leprosy ; where-upon the poet composed a hundred stanzas in praise of the Sun-god, thru whose power his leprosy was removed. This is in itself interesting, and undoubtedly based on good old magico-medical theory ; compare the Atharva-veda hymn I. 22, especially verse 1, in which the sun is used in curing jaundice.

Both of these works are included in the present volume, and in fact they form nearly the whole of Mayūra's extant writings. The rest are merely some scattering verses attributed to Mayūra in various anthologies.

The more interesting of these two works is the Mayūrāstaka, or 'Mayūra's Eight (Stanzas)', which Dr. Quackenbos himself discovered and edited for the first time, from a unique manuscript in the library of the University of Tübingen, in JAOS. 31. 343 ff. This edition and the accompanying translation are reprinted, with slight changes, in the present book. Unhappily the manuscript is damaged, so that two of the eight stanzas are fragmentary. Facsimiles are furnished in this book of the three pages of the manuscript, which is written in Sāradā characters. The poem is ultra-erotic in character, and fits very well the tradition about its origin. Indeed, as the editor remarks, we can hardly blame the lady to whom it was address for being offended by its obscenity.

Much better known, but to the general reader less interesting, is the Sūryaśataka or 'Hundred (Stanzas in praise) of the Sun'. It consists in its present form of 101 stanzas ; the last stanza, which may possibly be a later addition, is an *envoi* promising absolution from sins and freedom from disease to the mortal who shall read thru the work but once, with proper devotion. Some readers may think that some such reward would be well earned. The poem is an example of the extreme of the so-called Kāvya style. In many of its verses there is not lacking a certain magnificence. Ornament is piled on elaborate ornament, till the result reminds one of a Hindu temple. And one cannot but admire the ingenuity with which a rather limited theme is varied and modulated by the exuberant fancy of the poet. But it must be said that this ingenuity often manifests itself not so much in genuine poetic images as in elaborate and intricate mazes of puns—long concatenations of plays upon words, which drive the translator to desperation. For instance, Dr. Quackenbos not infrequently has to translate an entire stanza twice, to bring out the double meanings which run thru the whole of it. This is, of course, characteristic of this whole sphere of Sanskrit poetry. Mythological allusions, too, are very abundant, and furnish the poet with many of the poetic figures of which he must have been most proud. It is not, of course, the poet's fault that these greatly add to the obscurity of his poem to Westerners. Dr. Quackenbos's very full and

excellent notes¹ furnish an indispensable first-aid in this respect, as in many others. But when all has been done that can be done, many of the stanzas must remain—as indeed the poet undoubtedly intended that they should—objects of study and meditation rather than of casual reading. They are puzzles, rather than what we understand by literature. This is quite typical of the esthetic ideals of the Kāvya style. Even a Sanskritist—nay, even our very diligent and careful editor—must admit in a few cases that the meaning remains obscure to him, in spite of the utmost pains. *Kim punar anye 'py anabhi-yuktāḥ*—what then can we expect of more casual readers?

The Cāndīśatāka, or 'Hundred (Stanzas in praise) of Cāndī', by Bāṇa, said to have been written in rivalry against the Sūryāśatāka of Mayūra, is in general a work of the same sort. Its (accurately) 102 stanzas are devoted to the laud of the goddess Cāndī or Pārvatī, consort of Civa. And in fact all but four of them deal with one single myth about her—her slaying of the demon Mahiṣa by a blow of her foot (which in one stanza is ungallantly compared to the Vindhya Mountain). This limitation of the theme makes the stanzas considerably more monotonous than those of the Sūryāśatāka. But on the other hand the language, tho by no means simple, is much less intricate and difficult than that of the rival poem; it is much easier reading.

While, as has been said, the Mayūrāśatāka has never been edited or translated except by Dr. Quackenbos (nor is there any native commentary to it), the editor was assisted in his work on the two other poems by editions and native commentaries, and in the case of the Sūryāśatāka by the Italian translation of Bernheimer. His work, however, is independent and scholarly. His attitude towards the Hindu commentators appears to be judiciously critical. I have even noted one or two instances in which it seems to me that he has unwisely departed from the commentator's explanation (e. g. C. S. 46, note 4). As I have no access to the commentators, I can judge of this matter only by the editor's quotations from them in his notes. Occasionally, of course, opinions may differ as to whether the editor is right in following the commentary. Thus, in S. S. 55 c, it seems to me that *nandināndinindāḥ* clearly means "Nandi's joyful shout", and that the commentator's gloss *murajavīśesa*, "a kind of drum", for *nāndī*, which as Q. says has no warrant in any lexicon, should be disregarded. But on the whole I am much impressed with the zeal and care and good scholarly judgment which Dr. Quackenbos has applied to his none too easy task.

¹The notes are indeed rather too full. They frequently dilate at length on simple or obvious matters.

It is in large measure not Quackenbos's fault, as I have intimated, that in spite of all his energy and intelligence there remain, after all, quite a good many points, large and small, which are in need of further elucidation. Of this Quackenbos—who is nothing if not modest, sometimes almost over-modest—is of course quite aware. As anyone who has ever been a text-editor knows, it is bound to happen that a few things will occur to one who takes up a text for the first time, which have not occurred to another who knows the text by heart—just for that very reason. Freshness of approach gives a certain advantage, especially if it can rest upon the results attained by the patient study of others. So, standing on the broad shoulders of Quackenbos's labors, I have tried to pick a few still ungathered fruits from this *durdroha-druma*, tree that is not easily scaled. I hope the following remarks may add something, if only a little, to the understanding of the text.

S. S. 29 a, *tiṣṭram nirvāṇahetur*, and S. S. 86 c, *tāpasyā 'pi hetur . . . ekanirvāṇaddayi*. Q. fails to remember here that the literal meaning of *nirvāṇa* is "extinction" (as of fire); cf. C. S. 34 a, where he understands it correctly. The sun is "hot", or "the cause of heat", yet also "the cause (the sole giver) of *nirvāṇa* (extinction—as of fire or heat)."—In the same stanza S. S. 29, I think *iha . . . aparam* in pāda b means "in this world . . . in the other world" rather than "near . . . remote."

S. S. 12 d, *acaramāś*, of the rays of the sun, is questioningly rendered "(not-western, that is) eastern". It means "having no last", that is, of which none is the last, appearing simultaneously, not *seriatim*; all equal and like. It is not recorded elsewhere, to my knowledge, in Classical Sanskrit, tho it is used once in the Rigveda (5. 58. 5, of the Maruts, compared to the spokes of a wheel, "all equal"); and in Pāli *apubbam acarimām* together are used in the same sense in the Milindapañha (Trenckner, page 40, third line from bottom), and in other places, meaning "in a manner having no first and no last", "simultaneously" (cf. Morris, JPTS. 1887, p. 101, and Rhys Davids, SBE. XXXV, p. 64).

S. S. 21 c, *kartum nā 'lam nimeśam divasam api param* *yat* is rendered: "And it (the sun) is unable to <make> a wink, altho it can <create> the noble day" (the angle-brackets are used by Q. to indicate translations of *doubles ententes*). I should render: "It is unable to make a wink (punningly, a minute), but on the other hand (it can make) a day." *Nimeśa* means both "wink" and "minute" or "instant", a small unit of time; *param* I think is an adverb. Sūrya is of course proverbially the "Day-maker". Bernheimer's rendering, quoted in Q.'s note, is wholly wrong. The point is that the Sun can

and does make a day, which is a large period of time, tho it cannot make a (small period of time, an instant; but really, a) wink.

S. S. 75 c, *kālavyālasya cihnām*: "it (the sun's disk) is the (crest-) ornament of the Serpent Time." Q. renders "Serpent of Time" and is uncertain who is meant; the serpent is Time itself, for, in Sanskrit as in English, Time is "creeping". In Vikramacarita, Metrical Recension 9 (11). 10, occurs the phrase *dinamanīḥ sarpatkālasarpaṇiromanīḥ*, "the jewel of day (the sun), the head-gem of the serpent, creeping Time." This is a strikingly perfect parallel to the expression under discussion.

These are the most important and certain of the corrections of the translation which I have been able to make. The rest are either minor points, or less certain. With them I follow the order of the printed book.

Mayūrāstaka: I a: *prastutāngī*, perhaps "with limbs prepared (for love)" rather than "with beautiful limbs."—d: read "*gūhya* (*āgūhya*)?"—2 c, and 5 d: *kena* in both cases to be taken as attributive to the following instrumental noun: "by what bee . . .", "by what demon . . ."—5 a: may not *pathi* be for *pathi*, "on the path", with metrical lengthening of *i*?—7 b: *prabhācandravat*, perhaps "like the resplendent moon (in its crescent shape)."—8 a: *bhāva* in connexion with *hāva* must, I think, mean "passion"; the two terms are frequently associated thus. "Shining with love, allurement, and passion."

Suryāstaka: 6 c: *nighna*, perhaps better "full of" than "subject [only] to."—8 d: I think *khacita* means "studded", as if with jewels.—10 a: *bandha*, in the second rendering, "enclosure (in the bud)".—b: probably no *double entente* in *lokānām*.—d: *ketavah* perhaps "eclipsers" (and punningly, "rays"). Ketu, the Dragon's Tail, the ninth planet, is mythologically the body of the demon of eclipse, whose head is Rāhu.—15 a: *madhura* better "charming" than "soft", in both renderings.—18 b, c: the passage is hard, but I suggest that *pradeśasthito 'pi* goes with the following. "Tho it remains fixedly (appears regularly) in (the same) place (it always comes in the east), because of due regard for place and time, still it attains to the name of 'new' in Indra's quarter (it is nevertheless called 'new' every time it arises)".—23 b: the concept of "ink" is not needed for *kajjala*; darkness is directly compared to lamp-black.—25 a: *prāśamita*°, "that is powerful enough to overcome the strength of the mighty stars."—b: *līlayā*, "easily" rather than "scornfully"?—30: tho Q.'s general idea is correct, I should phrase his summary of the stanza (in note 1) rather thus: "The splendor of jewels is useful for ornamentation; of fire, for burning wood etc.; of the moon, for giving refreshment by its own coolness; but the splendor of

the sun exceeds each of these in its own field; for it adorns the three worlds, burns sin, and gives refreshment by rain."—31 d: *avalidham* is literally "lickt".—32 d: I do not think there is any double entente in *añjana*, which probably cannot mean "fire", in spite of Viçva in ÇKD.—38 b: *parihṛta*°, "envelops, because of its subtlety, the utmost recesses" etc.; *upānta* adjective.—39 c: *dīnmukhānām*, simply "quarters" (literally, faces of the q.). There is something wrong with this line; *anu* can hardly be rendered twice as Q. has done; but I don't see thru it.—42 d: *sphuṭa*°, perhaps also punningly, of the sun: "it is the occasion of the expanded-lotus-cup" (*apāçraya*=*āçraya*).—45 b: *-pr̥thuśvāsa*-, "their panting is abundant"; *śramena* should be translated with this line, "parcht with fatigue."—d: *sarala*, "outstrecht" (necks).—46 c: *kaṭaka*, "ridge", better than "zone"; *kliṣṭasūtā* doubtless has the meaning suggested as a second alternative in note 9, cf. 48 c.—48, note 5, last line on page; the point is lost unless "mares" be substituted for "other horses".—52 a: *dūranamrāir*, "who make obeisance from a (respectful) distance."—55 b: *param* probably adverb, "moreover".—d: *vinatānandānām*, simply "son of V."—56 c: *kula*-, "noble" (lit. "of [good] family").—62 d: *avatāra*, "arriving at, coming to."—78 b: *taditi* seems to be rendered "with a crash"; of course it means "with a flash of lightning."—85 c: *aparavāśo*, perhaps "subdued, not one's own master", and so "ill", cf. *a-svastha*.—98 b, c: I think Bernheimer was right in taking *gām* as "earth" and *-grāva-* as "rocks"; *go* "sky" and *grāvan* "clouds" are supported only by Nāigh.—Understand *vilīna* literally, "melted".

Anthology Stanzas: Śiva and Pārvatī, 2 a: *kim me duro-dareṇa*, means (freely) "what did I say about the dice-play? (that is, I didn't say anything about it)".

Candisataka: 3 c and 4 d: *jayati*, *jayanti* should be translated "hail to", as has been rightly done in 21, 33, 38, 54, 71, 102.—18 d: *kula*-, "noble", seems to be omitted in the translation.—37 d: would it not be better to take *kurvāñā sarvam* with the prec., "doing everything as before in the case of Paçupati", and *īśad* as part of the fol. cpd., "with slightly laid-on foot-lac"?—39 a: *āvyomavyāpīśīmām* would be much better taken as a cpd., as suggested in note.—46 a: *dhṛtim akṛta*, perhaps better "did (not) stop still", in both cases (in the first case perhaps with double meaning, "took no pleasure"); *dele* "because of his fondness for dissension".—67 c: *mātūr* better with *mahiṣavadhamāhe*?—97, note 3: this is correct, but it should have been brought out clearly in the translation; it is a commonplace use of *kva* . . . *kva*.—102 d: *sarvāñgīnām*, perhaps adverb, "whole-body-wise", "in a manner that affected his whole body"; or if adj., "with his whole body"; in any

case the body must be Mahiṣa's, not Candi's. I think Q. fails to understand quite what is meant by Monier Williams' definition. Bühler's rendering is free but essentially correct.

On page 237, V. L. to Bāṇa's 'Traveler', (c), Q. reads *cch* for *ch* "for metrical reasons"—quite unnecessarily, since *ch* always counts as a double consonant for metrical purposes. So he repeatedly prints *cch* at the beginning of a word, where *ch* is more proper; e. g. C. S. 22 a.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS, M. L., M. A., Ph. D., Professor of English Literature in Beloit College. Published under the Auspices of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916.

This is an admirable piece of work. When a mature scholar who might well have been devoting himself to his own problems spends years in searching, compiling and summarizing to form a tool which will save others from having to do the like, we can only say 'Ingentes gratias agimus', without the risk of eternally scratching ourselves among the flatterers. Indeed, the perseverance, grasp and judgment involved in an extensive critical bibliography make it of the nature of a direct contribution to knowledge; it is a history of scholarship on the subject concerned.

The increase of such tools as concordances and bibliographies gives us the agreeable feeling that early English studies have passed out of their nownage. There may be a little regret that we can less often than once look at each other with a wild surmise as some new planet swims into our ken, though even that pleasure may still be had; but we can be more confident of not overlooking an old one, and can more easily make the combinations which produce new knowledge, and can in some sort grasp the scheme of things entire. Such bibliographies as those of Ward and Herbert, and Miss Billings' incomplete one, for the romances, that of Child for the ballads, Miss Hammond's for Chaucer, C. F. Brown's for the religious lyric (Bibliographical Society, 1916), and those in the Cambridge History of English Literature, give us in more or less degree this feeling of confidence and grasp. There is still greatly needed a bibliography for the Middle English (and Anglo-

Saxon) linguistic field; for the historical, we have Gross; and for the literary,—here we are.

Dr. Wells' plan is most comprehensive; to include the facts about "all the extant writings in print, from single lines to the most extensive pieces, composed in English between 1050 and 1400", as well as some later ones; to give descriptions and summaries, and to epitomize critical and historical fact and opinion about them. This forms the first and longer part of his imposing volume. The Bibliographical Notes "seek to indicate all the really valuable prints, editions, and discussions of the several writings and classes or types of writing". The work is therefore meant to be neither a literary history nor a bibliography pure and simple, but a summary of fact and opinion, and an indication of where to go for it all in full.

Both parts will be valuable and convenient for the beginning student and the accomplished scholar; will save their time, and supersede or at least supplement their own collections. One of the most laborious and valuable elements in the work is the sorting out and classifying of the whole enormous material. The classification and arrangement are sometimes a trifle arbitrary, and inconsistent without advantage; it is odd to interject proverbs, and scientific and informational treatises, among religious authors and works, and chapters on lyric and drama among those on the chief individual authors; to separate political lyrics (only) from the main chapter on lyrics. The summaries of works, while generally accurate and useful, are needlessly long where the subject is familiar, as with Chaucer, since the book is hardly for the general reader. The ten-page account of Chaucer's life seems superfluous. In his high admiration for *Piers Plowman* and a slight tendency to underrate Chaucer, Dr. Wells reveals an inclination toward a moral interest in the content rather than an esthetic interest in the content and form of literature. The book contains a considerable amount of original literary criticism; accordingly, we sometimes find a curious combination of censure, appreciation and impersonal scholarship, with perhaps over-much of the two former for an objective work. It certainly trenches on the ground of history which it professes to avoid. The natural conception of such a book is that it should contain a minimum with which the user may disagree. The criticism makes good reading, however. Some would have preferred, perhaps, that the two grand divisions of the work should have been combined; that a statement of the main facts about each item should have been followed (but only for the less well-known works) by a brief summary and criticism; and those by a critical and summarizing bibliography. Thus opinions would have been at once referred to their authors, and time would have been saved, in many cases, at least.

As to what will probably be for most workers the most valuable part of the work, the bibliography, utter completeness is probably unattainable and is certainly needless. A somewhat careful examination of crucial parts shows that Dr. Wells' aim at substantial completeness was in general successful. For Chaucer he means to supplement, not to supersede, Miss Hammond's Bibliographical Manual, to which he sends the reader for each item. Miss Hammond's note on the Franklin's Tale in *Modern Language Notes*, XXVII. 91-2, should have been mentioned, since it is later than her Manual; Gummere on Chaucer's medieval and modern sides, in the *Modern Language Publications*, XVI. xxxvii-xl, should have been mentioned, as being of general interest and as ignored by Miss Hammond. For Layamon (so-called; if Dame Siri3, p. 178, Ernle3e, p. 191, why not La3amon?) there might be mentioned an account and specimen of the Caligula MS in the New Paleographical Society, Ser. 1, vol. 2 (London, 1903-12), plate 86; a review of Hoffmann's dissertation by Jordan in *Engl. Stud.* XLII. 262-4; an article on Anglo-Norman words in La3amon by Payne in *Notes and Queries* (1869), Ser. 4, vol. 4, pp. 26-7. On Godric and his lyrics reference might have been made to Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (Rolls Ser.), II. 264-274, 352, and to Giraldus Cambrensis (ib.), II. 214-6. On Gower's *Mirour* (not *Miroir*) de l'Omme reference might have been made (as to the date) to G. L. Kittredge, *Date of Chaucer's Troilus* (*Chaucer Soc.* 1909), 80-2, and to the present reviewer's *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works* (ib. 1907), pp. 220-225; also to *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXI. 239-240. A recording in print of Professor Wells' minor slips would serve no good purpose.

A reviewer's difficulty is often that the enumeration of minor matters which he would have liked to see otherwise fills more space and sometimes makes more impression than his words of warm appreciation. The present reviewer will round out by repeating his first sentence. This is an admirable piece of work.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

Les Anciens Peuples de l'Europe. GEORGES DOTTIN. Pp. XIV + 302. (Vol. I of Collection pour l'étude des antiquités nationales.) C. Klincksieck, Paris, 1916.

M. Camille Jullian announces that he and M. Dottin, in beginning the publication of a series of works upon the antiquities of France, have wished to inaugurate the collection by

dedicating the first volume to the most ancient peoples of all Europe. A number of other volumes are already under way, and the names of Cagnat, Toutain, Besnier—to mention only a few—are indicative of the character of the work which will appear in this new series.

M. Jullian writes the introduction to this first volume. He says that he considers the purpose of the book is to show how necessary it is for the historian to make himself acquainted with the literature, the archaeology, the political economy, the anthropology, the geology, and so on, of a country. He calls Fustel de Coulanges to witness that history is the most difficult of all sciences. But he also seems to recognize in his phrase—even if it is said in another connection—“*il n'est pas bon, en matière d'histoire, d'avoir trop d'esprit*”, that many of M. Dottin's pages are rather heavily loaded with narrative that is not entirely unlike a cross between a Catalogue of the Ships and a first chapter of St. Matthew.

After the first chapter, which is entitled *Les Sources*, but which might as well have been called *Caveat Lector*, one comes to forty pages on *Les Civilisations* which give a clear and readable account of the various cultural strata of the European peoples. The author has handled his sources with acumen and diligence, and one is fain to believe that he has not used some of the latest books because he felt some hesitancy as to the final acceptance of many of the results set forth in them. *Les Peuples* is the title of the third chapter, which fills pages 66-224. Here the author takes up all the European peoples one after another and follows their movements as mentioned in the ancient writers, with an occasional reference to archaeological and anthropological material. He recognizes as precarious the results gained from ancient sources as to the life of peoples, but thinks it interesting and perhaps useful to make a grouping of customs. Thus he finds (page 73) that women worked in the fields among certain peoples, that a community of land is found among others, that cannibalism is mentioned among still others, that here there is polygamy and there community of women, that matriarchy, tattooing, hospitality, human sacrifice, and so on, are elsewhere. It would have been more interesting if the idea could have been developed so that something would seem to have been proved. M. Dottin seems to entertain a genial openmindedness as to the Amazons, and for him the Pelasgi are a mighty people. Whether he has not allowed himself to be contaminated with the prevalent view of late years about the Pelasgi, or is taking up cudgels to restore to a place in the sun a people which has been a bit over-relegated into oblivion, I cannot quite determine. M. Dottin also deals at length with the Ligures, and makes them out a great people who inhabited much of Italy and who spread their power up the Rhone, and perhaps

as far as Spain. But what if the Ligures had been an Alpine people who could not live on the coast or in the low river valleys, or what if they and the Veneti had earlier been one Po valley people and had been split apart by invaders from the north and forced back, the one into the high mountains above Genoa, and the other into the marsh lands at the mouth of the Po? It would have been well to note the discussion of the Ligures in Ridge-way's chapter in *A Companion to Latin Studies*, and in Peet's *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*. The work of Pinza seems not to be known at all to M. Dottin.

The last chapter (IV) is a short one on the local and general history of Europe. It is like the third chapter in being a mass of proper names. They are necessary, no doubt, and M. Dottin must be congratulated on having brought such a mass of material into so small a compass. And yet one cannot help but feel that overmuch weight is given to the ancient sources—they make up about nine-tenths of the citations—for they are generally considered pretty unreliable in their statements about the comings and goings of ancient peoples. None the less, the book is a valuable manual and will be warmly welcomed.

R. V. D. MAGOFFIN.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Arden Shakespeare: General Editor, C. H. HERFORD, Litt. D. *The Merchant of Venice*, edited by H. L. WITHERS, B. A., the American edition revised by MORRIS W. CROLL, Ph. D. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, edited by E. K. CHAMBERS, B. A., the American edition revised by EDITH RICKERT, Ph. D. *As You Like It*, edited by J. C. SMITH, M. A., the American edition revised by ERNEST HUNTER WRIGHT, Ph. D.

A certain well-known college professor used to begin his lectures on Shakespeare with the frank statement that the object of his course was to find out what the language of Shakespeare means. The result was an absorption in questions of grammar and philology and an unfortunate neglect of the plays as poetry. The editors of the Arden Shakespeare, seeking to maintain a more appropriate relation between literary appreciation and linguistics, have chosen to emphasize the literary aspect of the plays. The revised American edition preserves the general character previously given to the series. The text is preceded in each volume by a literary history of the

play, including a generous discussion of the sources, the structure, and the important characters. It is followed by copious notes, which reflect the prevailing interest in the unfolding of the plot rather than in language, and by appendices dealing with special problems. An explanation of the metre is also provided by each editor.

The series provides a useful text of Shakespeare for the general reader, who must rely for guidance wholly upon his editor, as well as for the use of schools, in which a competent teacher may readily supplement the apparatus. The discussion of Shakespeare's sources might profitably include brief extracts as well as a statement of the literary problems. In "As You Like it", for example, Lodge's Rosalind and even the Tale of Gamelyn might well be so represented.

J. C. FRENCH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Seneca: *ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. With an English translation by RICHARD M. GUMMERE. Vol. I. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917. \$1.50.

This new volume of the Loeb Classical Library is an excellent translation of the first sixty-five Letters to Lucilius. It follows Seneca's own rule, "ut non verbis serviamus, sed sensibus"; and it actually reproduces something of his 'pointed style'. One passage needs revision, namely, the rendering of the wonderful description of the stately, conscious Roman speech, "Romanus sermo magis se circumspicit et aestimat praebetque aestimandum" (Ep. 40, 11). This suggests the slow processional march of some stately figure who looks around upon herself, or upon her train, and 'takes stock of' herself, and allows the spectators time to do the same. Professor Gildersleeve has suggested that in the *κατασκελής* of Dionysios Hal. (Iud. Isocr. 3) we have "an admirable adjective for the deliberate, swaying, processional style of Isokrates" (A. J. P. XI 372), and it is possible that Seneca's epithet 'gradarius' should be interpreted in much the same way—"Cicero . . . gradarius fuit". In the same section 'interpungere' can hardly be taken literally, of the separation of the words in Roman texts. In Ep. 46, 1, 'levis' probably refers to the bulk of the book, rather than to the style. The conjecture 'qui titubat' for 'qui itaque?' (Ep. 40, 9) is not very convincing. 'Conferet', p. 370, l. 2, is a misprint for 'conferret', and on p. 81, l. 11, the word 'as' should be struck out.

W. P. MUSTARD.

REPORTS.

HERMES, XLVIII.

Fascicle 3.

Zur Geschichte der meteorologischen Litteratur (321-358). W. Capelle sketches the ancient history of Meteorology, with special reference to the terms applied to this study (cf. A. J. P. XXXV, p. 218, XXXVII, p. 491). Aristotle laid the foundation with his *Μετεωρολογικά*, which dealt with sublunar phenomena; but included, besides comets, meteors, etc., also earthquakes, hydrology and even the milky way. Theophrastus avoids the ambiguity of *μετέωρος*, by using the words *μετάροος* and *οὐράνιος* of meteorological and astronomical phenomena, respectively, and entitled his work *Μεταροολογικά*. Posidonius adopted this terminology, except that his regular word for astronomical facts was *μετέωρα*. After Posidonius only compilations and extracts of meteorological works were made, in which the terminology wavered, until the authority of Aristotle established the more familiar word meteorology.

Studien zur Entstehung der Plebs (359-377). A. Rosenberg, from the meaning of *sacrosanctus*, the institution of the tribunate and the *lex Icilia de Aventino*, reaches conclusions that are based on Ed. Meyer (A. J. P. XVII, p. 379). The majority of the original inhabitants of Rome were Latin merchants, artisans, etc., who, with increasing prosperity, naturally aspired to citizenship; and, failing of this, then succeeded in obtaining from the ruling class the privilege of organizing themselves into four tribes with their own magistrates: tribunes, iudices decemviri and aediles, all of whom, by a *foedus*, were declared to be *sacrosancti*, a term used in agreements between independent states, which, in the absence of a supreme power to enforce the provisions, were accustomed to proclaim an offender as *sacer*. When the power of the plebs became predominant in 287 b. c., the *sacrosancti*, now only the tribunes, were protected by the government. The above four tribes worshiped on the Aventine the Latin goddess Diana, in whose temple the oldest document (456 b. c.?) pertaining to the plebs was preserved. This granted them the privilege of dwelling on the Aventine. The Roman state, at that time, was composed of three classes: the ruling patricians, the dependent peasantry and, holding an intermediate position, the four tribes of the plebs. It now became the ambition of the dependent peasants to obtain similar rights, which was consummated in the estab-

lishment of the sixteen rural tribes. The patricians may have thought that, as these new tribes were composed of their clients, they would strengthen their power, whereas the result was the ultimate predominance of the common people. The discussion of passages from the historians, and other details are interesting.

Hippokratische Forschungen IV (378-407). H. Diels here (cf. A. J. P. XXXV, p. 222; XXXVI, p. 351), elucidates and emends the text of the treatise *de arte*, with some sharp criticism of Gomperz' edition, as well as of the author, a polyhistor sophist, who was bent on displaying his rhetorical skill. Gomperz errs in attributing the work to Protagoras (A. J. P. XI 529). D. closes with a supplement to Hauler's collation of two MSS.

Plotinische Studien (408-425). H. F. Müller, the veteran editor and interpreter of Plotinus (cf. Berl. Phil. W. 1908, p. 899), by means of the exegesis of selected passages and a consideration of the general character of P.'s philosophy, shows that C. Steinhart (Pauly, RE.) and Ed. v. Hartmann (Gesch. d. Metaphysik I) are right in denying for Plotinus a doctrine of emanation, over against the positive assertion of M. Heinze (Protest. Realencycl. V and XIII; cf. Grundriss d. Gesch. d. Phil.⁷, p. 311).

Solon und Peisistratos (426-441). E. von Stern constructs the version of the old Attic chronicle, dealing with Solon's opposition to Peisistratus' request for a body-guard, etc., and the latter's leniency, from Aristotle, Aelian and a few points in Plutarch, in substantial agreement with Busolt (II 311-315), from whom (p. 315, n. 2) he has apparently adopted the name Hegesistratus for the archon Hegestratos (cf. Plut. Solon 32 and Kirchner, Prosopogr. 6309). Aristotle initiated the biographical utilization of Solon's poems. A comparison of the above sources with Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius and Hermippus (in Plutarch), shows how the original account was expanded through sensationalism and error. S. argues that the number fifty of the body-guard granted to Peisistratus, according to Plutarch (Solon 30), was derived by an old chronicler from the original decree, as well as the name Aristion, who proposed it. The conventional use, however, of this number makes this doubtful; neither Herodotus (I 59), nor Aristotle (Polit. 14), specify a number.

Horaz C. I 34 (442-449). W. W. Jaeger shows that the *Fortuna* of this ode is the Asiatic-Hellenistic *Tύχη*; not the early conception of a guardian of kings; but *Tύχη-Πεπρωμένη*, the world power, to which the numerous sudden and unexpected political upheavals in Alexandrian and Roman times were due. Diespiter etc. serves only as the apparatus poeticus.

The central thought lies in the last five verses. J. gives an interesting excursus on the development of this divinity and its characteristics.

Lateinische Gedichte auf Inschriften (450-457). W. Heraeus discusses Einar Engström's *Carmina latina epigr.* (1912). In no. 108 (VI century), from a stone in Africa, he recognizes Martial I 40 (41): *Qui ducis vultus etc.*, the *ista* of which evidently refers to the Christian inscription on the left. This further proof of *toto notus in orbe Martialis* may be added to Mart. VI 76, 4 and II 59, 4, found on late Christian stones in Seville (Spain) and in Britain. Part of Mart. I 114 appears in no. 362. Poetical reminiscences of Tibullus and of the *Carmina Priapea* are also pointed out. Corrections of text and interpretation are given. In Diehl's collection of lat. altchristl. Inschriften², no. 6 is printed as prose, although it is clearly in iambic senarii, with a Christian tag in prose.

Die rechtliche Bedeutung der Inauguration beim Flaminat (458-463). St. Brassloff argues that the nomination of a flamen Dialis required confirmation by *inauguratio* (cf. Gaius Inst. I 130; III 114; Ulpian fgm. X, 5). The passage in Livy 40, 42, 8 ff., on which the prevailing opposite view is based, really confirms his position, inasmuch as here the second alternate was straightway inaugurated when the proceedings of the comitia calata, dealing with the first nominee, had been interrupted by a divine sign. The laying of a fine on the recalcitrant first nominee by the *pontifex maximus* was an act of anticipation. The nomination of a vestal virgin was different as here the inauguration took place *pro collegio*, and so followed without any interval of time.

Zu Diokles (464-468). M. Wellmann defends the genuineness of a citation from Diocles of Carystus in ps.-Galen XIX 529 ff. (K.), against J. Heeg (Sitzungsb. d. Königl. Pr. Ak. d. W. 1911).

Miscellen: N. J. Krom (469-471) calls attention to a Sanskrit inscription from Gwalior, central India, found 1909 (cf. Ann. Report, Arch. Survey of India 1908-9, Calcutta 1912, p. 126 ff.), which shows that Heliodorus, a Greek, but a worshiper of Krishna, came from Taxila (Cf. Kiepert, Lehrb. d. alt. Geogr. p. 36) as an ambassador of Antalcidas, thus locating the last of the later Greek kings (circ. 150 B. C.). K. discusses some transliterations, viz., 'Αγησίλας> Agiçala, showing η>i, circ. 78 A. D.—R. M. Meyer (471-474) in answer to Reitzenstein (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 216), cites other passages from Tacitus in favor of an old Arminius ballad; but especially the funeral lament over Attila (Jordanes 257, cf. Paul u. Braunes Beitr. 37, 537 f.).—A. Gudeman (474-477) makes it

probable that the unsuitable *sudibus* in Eumenius paneg. 9[4 Bs.¹]2, 3, was derived from Tac. dialog. 34, l. 21, where all the MSS erroneously have *sudibus* (for *rudibus*), and utilizes this fact as another proof of the authorship of Tacitus.—K. Praechter (477-480) discovers a new fragment of Ariston of Chios in Comm. in Arist. Graeca XX, Bk. V, p. 248, 17 ff., where 'Αριστών ὁ Χίος (χ+1, appearing like M) was corrupted into 'Αριστώνομος> 'Αριστώνυμος. No new doctrine of A. is obtained; but interesting is the polemic against his point of view, which is essentially like Cicero, de off. 1, 6 and de fin. 2, 43; 3, 50.—M. Holleaux (480) sends corrections for p. 75 ff.

Fascicle 4.

Per l'interpretazione del testo etrusco di Agram (481-493). E. Lattes discusses Etruscan words, particularly *vinum*, on the linen mummy-cloths at Agram, with especial regard for G. Herbig's views. He expresses his belief that we have here a funerary document, in which the words *fle* and *vinum* are associated with the name of a deity, implying libations. (Cf. Berl. Phil. W. 1903, nos. 5 and 6, and 1904, nos. 19 and 20.)

Über Lukians Phalarideen (494-521). B. Keil analyses the two Phalaris speeches α and β , showing the Lysianic style of α and the more rhetorical character of β . The latter comprises sections 1-9; then follow sections 10-13, which, he shows, are made up of six excerpts, carelessly added to β from a similar, third speech, which like β presupposed α . It was still more rhetorical than β ; but much less so than the undoubtedly genuine *Tυραννοκτόνος*.

Plautusstudien. I. Stoffprobleme des Rudens (522-541). G. Thiele discusses the plot, as originally obtained from Diphilus. Leo pointed out the influence of tragedy on the *Rudens*; but its main motif, the storm and wreck, appears nowhere in tragedy; whereas it occurs frequently in novelistic literature, to which the comic poets frequently turned in search of new material. Hence it is significant that the chief catastrophe in the *Historia Apollonii* is a wreck on the coast of Cyrene, especially as the loose combination with an erotic adventure is also found in Apollonius, where it seems more natural. Th. discusses the local descriptions and their romantic color in the New Comedy, and points out a number of such passages in the *Rudens*, which surpasses the extant plays of the New Comedy in this respect. Other romantic features are also pointed out. The *Vidularia*, based on the same plot, is later than the *Rudens*. A search for New Comedy plots in Christian romances and legends and in the *Gesta Romanorum* is desirable.

Die *Epitoma* des *Livius* (542-557). A. Klotz attacks the prevailing belief in an epitome of *Livy* that has been assumed to explain linguistic differences between *Livy* and authors depending on him. These differences can be amply explained by the popularity of a collection of historical exempla (cf. A. J. P. XXXIV, p. 224). The widespread use of a *Livy*-epitome is questionable, as the whole work continued in use, for which, besides other evidence, K. cites *Symmachus*, epist. IX 13. The *periochae*, of course, point to the whole work, barring the lost books 136 and 137; and at least two sets of these existed, if not four (including that of *Martial* XIV 190). The problem of certain disagreements of the *periochae* with *Livy*, can be understood, as they were detached, and, leading an independent existence, were subjected to changes and contamination; here too the influence of the exempla can be proved. The theory that the *periochae* developed out of an epitome disregards the fact that the early epitomes reduced the number of books of the original. *Justin's* epitome of *Trogus* represents a later practice. His date probably falls in the fourth century.

Ὑποθῆκαι (558-616). P. Friedländer discusses under this title *Hesiod's Erga*, *Theognis'* elegies (mainly vv. 1-254), and a few *ὑποθῆκαι* of *Democritus*, which were part of a work not identical with his *Περὶ εὐθυμίης*. The lost *Χίρωνος* *Ὑποθῆκαι*, of which he gives an account, has suggested the title of the article. As an appellative we find *ὑποθῆκαις Ἡσιόδοι* in I. G. VII, 4240 (cf. *Isocrates* *Πρὸς Νικοκλέα* § 43). By means of careful analysis F. finds threads of association and form, which reveal an original unity in all of these works. This loose method of binding together seemingly independent parts should be recognized as characteristic of this type of literature. Thus in *Hesiod*, contentious *Eris* has her place in vv. 1-302, competitive *Eris* in vv. 383-694; moreover these two parts are held together by a chain of gnomes (303-382), which are linked together by form and associated ideas. The precepts are frequently more intelligible when referred to actual events. *Theognis'* method of composition in vv. 1-254, is similar to that of *Hesiod*, and apparently independent parts have their connections, viz., vv. 29-128 might be entitled *Concerning Friends and Enemies*; vv. 129-196, *Concerning Riches and Poverty*; moreover the second series is anticipated in vv. 29/30. The selections from *Democritus* were chosen as representative of the oldest prose examples of *ὑποθῆκαι* literature, prose succeeding poetry here as in other branches of Greek literature.

Miscellen: F. Münzer (617-619) points out the rhetorical commonplaces in *Tacitus'* account of *Arminius* (ann. II 88), especially his dependence on *Xen. Cyrop.* I, 2, 1, the first literary biography devoted to a great man of a foreign race.—R. Reit-

zenstein (619-623) answers R. M. Meyer's defense of an Arminius ballad (see *Miscellen* 471-474 above), and concludes from the evidence that Meyer cites, that the existence of Arminius ballads lacks all proof.—O. Sch. von Fleschenberg (623-628) shows that Asclepiades Myrleanus subdivided his rhetorical classification of *ιστορία* according to an historical-realistic point of view, which explains the double occurrence of the *τρόπος γενεαλογικός*.—The same (629-630) shows that Apuleius, in his *ἡθοτούς* of the robber (*Met.* 81, 6-91, 8), aimed at a comic effect in combining the stories of Lamachus, Alcimus and Thrasyleon to exemplify the *γνώμη* that it is easier to break into the dwellings of the rich than of the poor.—K. Hubert (631-633) improves the order of the palimpsest fragments containing Cicero's *Pro M. Tullio* oration: § 52 is closely associated with §§ 38-46, and §§ 47-51 should follow §§ 53-56.—P. Stengel (634-636) discusses *προϊεράσθαι* in *Dittenb. Syll.* 627, 7 and *προϊερηγενέτω* in *Syll.* 599, 10 as synonyms of *κατάρχεσθαι*; the former is exactly like *προκατάρχεσθαι* in *Thuc.* I, 25. They do not mean 'to act as priest for another' (Fraenkel).—2. He emends in *Plut. Cim.* 18 *ἀπέτεμε* to *ἐνέτεμε*, which, strictly, would imply a *σφάγιον*; but Plutarch is not exact in his use of sacrificial terminology.—P. Maas (636) accepts H. Weil's proof, grounded on *Augustin. de mus.* 5, 26, that the equation $3^2+4^2=5^2$ is the ratio geometrica that Varro applied to the hexameter verse (cf. *Etudes de litt. et de rythm. gr.* (1902) 142); but considers his own interpretation worthy of note (cf. *A. J. P.* XXXVIII, p. 215).

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLV (1917).

Fascicolo 2.

Lvcretiana V. (177-189). Ettore Stampini discusses or emends the text of Lucretius V, 483-486; 878-881; 1442.

Di un *ἄπαξ εἰρημένον* logico o di pensiero presso Quintiliano (190-196). Pietro Rasi takes up anew and discusses at length the old *crux* of Vergil's *cui non risere parentes* (E. IV, 62) and Quintilian's citation of it (IX, 3, 8) as, *qui non risere parentes*. He supports the Vergilian text, *cui non*, etc., as just given. He thinks that Quintilian's citation of it as, *qui non* etc., was due either to a poor text or more likely to a poor memory.

La biblioteca di Zomino da Pistoia (197-207). Remigio Sabbadini gives an interesting account of Zomino (also Zombino).

Zembino, Zambino), born 1387, died 1458, ecclesiastic, author, and, in his time, a notable collector of books. Sabbadini gives a list of 111. Of these, 33 are now lost. The rest are scattered about in the various libraries mentioned by him.

Il codice Bresciano di Tibullo (208-239). Ferruccio Calonghi concludes his lengthy discussion of this manuscript and gives a careful and complete list of variants. His conclusions are that Br. was derived from a manuscript very similar to Ambr., much more so than to V. When there is a difference of reading between Ambr. and V., Br. generally agrees with Ambr. Br. may possibly go back to a copy of the archetype or even to a parallel of the archetype, but in either case to a manuscript more carelessly written than either A. or V.

Una polemica epicurea contro le dottrine stoiche della provvidenza, del fato, della fortuna contenuta nel papiro ercolanese 1670 (240-281). Ettore Bignone takes up this papyrus, already examined by Bassi in vol. XLIV, p. 47, of the *Rivista*, and subjects it to a thorough-going review and investigation. He believes that the writer was an Epicurean, probably Philodemus. At all events the subject is a polemic against the Stoic doctrine of Providence as developed by Chrysippus.

Recensioni (282-332).

Note bibliografiche (333-351).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (352-373).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (374-376).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BRIEF MENTION.

The scheme of the Journal allows a tithe to *Brief Mention*. In earlier days there was not the same affluence of contributions as there is now. In those times many of my own articles were written to fill gaps and I had little scruple in making broad my phylacteries. Of late, I have been embarrassed by an excess of material and I feel that apologies are due on my part to both readers and contributors for the inordinate number of pages that I have occupied in the present volume to the exclusion of more strictly philological work; for as I near the end, I find myself reverting to the earlier stages of my long career. The article on Paulus Silentarius grew out of a *Brief Mention*, and the same thing is true of the paper entitled *An Oxford Scholar* in another part of the present number. These things ought properly to have been reserved for a projected volume of *Brief Mentions Suppressed and Unsuppressed*, which I had in contemplation some years ago, and I sympathize with the παρακλανσίθυρα of those who are waiting to make their addresses to the public. But those who know the inside history of the Journal will pardon the superfluities of an editor who has renounced so much in order to furnish an arena for American scholarship and finds no other field open for the exercise of such activities as are left to him (A. J. P. XXXIII 227).

That consummate artist Jane Austen, the centenary of whose death was celebrated the other day, kept the turmoil of the great wars of her time out of her novels and when the world's great war of our time, of all times began, I tried to make the Journal a sheltered nook. But I have not succeeded. Eclipses of the sun repeat themselves under the foliage of rosebushes, and now that the word 'American' itself means war to the knife, the allusions become more patent and more pointed, although I have not forgotten my own admonitions against historical parallels and the so-called lessons of history. For many years the Germans have been the acknowledged leaders in Greek studies. Every now and then some German professor like the late Herr Jordan goes over bodily to the Roman camp, and the Graeculi are not handled with gloves by German exponents of classical perfection, but it is an inter-

esting speculation what will become of Greek studies in Germany after the war.

Much will necessarily be taboo. A correspondent informs me that a protest has been entered in Germany against including the Philippics of Demosthenes in the course of Greek studies. Perhaps the movement has been inspired from above,—the German 'from above', not the St. James 'from above'. In Jackson's Memoir of Bywater (p. 198), discussed in the earlier part of this number, it is recorded that the Emperor spoke airily, if not very tactfully to Bywater, a Professor of Greek, about the narrowing requirements of Greek in the German school system. The laborious analysis of Xenophon's Anabasis by Joost (A. J. P. XIV 102) is the result of a conviction that this limitation to the Kaiser's own range of reading would be welcome to the All Highest; and one is almost tempted to suspect that Wilamowitz's proposal to jettison the Greek accents is due to some court story about the Kaiser's schooldays. In the old days of the Fliegende Blätter there was a cartoon representing a subordinate official, some 'Staatshämorhoidarius', bowing to the ground before his chief with the legend from Alexander von Humboldt 'The curved line occurs only in organic nature'. Nothing is so well organized as Teutonic officialdom. We are and have been for years in the domain of 'Realpolitik' for which the 'Realgymnasium' had been preparing the way for many decades. And now quite apart from Wilhelm's general attitude towards Greek, Demosthenes' attitude towards the Emperor's predecessor in the superman business must be excluded from the school as possibly offensive to the Kaiser. Run through Olynthiacs and Philippics and you will find significant phrase after phrase. I have space for a few only. 1, 5: ὅλως ἄπιστον ὀλμαὶ ταῖς πολιτείαις η̄ τυρανίς. 2, 5: σφόδρ' ἀν-
ήγονύμην καντός φοβερὸν τὸν Φίλιππον καὶ θαυμαστόν, εἰ τὰ δίκαια πράττονθ' ἔωρων η̄νέγμενον. 9, 16: τὸ δ' ἐνσεβεῖς καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἄν τ' ἐπὶ μικροῦ τις ἄν τ' ἐπὶ μείζονος παραβαίνη, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν. 9, 26: πόλεις ἐπὶ Θράκης ἔω, ἀς ἀπάστας οὐτως ὡμῶς ἀνήρηκεν, ὥστε μηδ' εἰ πώποτ' φέρθησαν προσελθόντ' εἶναι βρέδιον εἰπεῖν. Very much alive are these ancients. A few months ago Deschanel quoted in an impassioned speech a passage from the prophecy of Darius in the Persae 821-2:

νῆβρις γὰρ ἔξανθούσ' ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν
ἄτης, δύεν πάγκλαυτον ἔξαμψ θέρος.

In a Bryn Mawr doctoral dissertation on *The Spurious Speeches of the Lysianic Corpus*, ANGELA C. DARKOW main-

tains that there is no satisfactory proof that Lysias or, in fact, any of the orators of the Attic canon wrote speeches for court—the latter an audacious thesis—and therefore the objection to the disputed speeches of Lysias that they are unsuited to the practical business of the law, falls to the ground; and that the deviations from Lysianic or even classical usage may have their *raison d'être* in the ethopoia for which Lysias was so renowned. The small number of extant speeches out of the portentously long list attributed to Lysias is in the eyes of the writer a proof that a severe censorship had been exercised by the ancient critics and is *prima facie* evidence in favour of the genuineness of the whole corpus, despite an occasional *ei γνήσιος*. Lysias, it seems, was no advocate employed in real cases but a literary artist and it is only as a literary artist that he appears in Plato's *Phaedrus* and as such he must be studied by us. According to Miss DARKOW Lysias gains rather than loses by this change of base. The note of actuality which some critics have recognized in such specimens of art as the wonderful First Oration is merely the effect of consummate skill. Proceeding on these assumptions, or what some people would consider assumptions, Miss DARKOW has carefully summarized and discussed the opinions of a number of scholars, for the speeches of Lysias have been fair game for the athetizers, *Tray*, *Blanch* and *Sweetheart*. Indeed there are only six of the thirty-one, the genuineness of which has not been impugned by dissertation-mongers and programmatists; and as Professor Sanders to whose guidance Miss DARKOW makes ample acknowledgement is a dog-fancier of high degree, an authority on the *Κυνηγετικός*, a specialist to whom I myself have appealed when attacked by a malapert critic in the matter of a Pindaric interpretation (A. J. P. XXVIII 110), I shall be forgiven for quoting the Xenophontean example I have imbedded in my S. C. G. 97: *τὰ κυνίδια . . . κυβιστῶν καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ μανθάνει*, especially as I gain thereby an opportunity to mend my translation and illustrate the origin of neuter plural and verb singular: *all puppydom* (*τὰ κυνίδια*) *learns to turn somersaults*; and intellectual somersaults are diverting rather than irritating. Read what Gomperz, the aged, has said of the youthful Bruns (A. J. P. XXIII 471). In all matters that involve the consultation of authorities I am *οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὐτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ* for I am somewhat in the case of Lysias' *ἀδύταρος*, if *ἰπέρ τοῦ ἀδυτάρου* is by Lysias—but being like Dogberry, a householder, I wonder how Lysias made his living after he lost all his property under the Thirty; for if there is scant evidence—as it seems to Miss DARKOW—that he followed the lucrative business of speech-writing, there is still less evidence that he took up the other and exceedingly lucrative business of teaching the young idea how to shoot the rapids of popular oratory.

The result of Miss DARKOW's studies is to let down the bars. The *χάρις* test which Dionysius applies is too vague (A. J. P. XXXIV 488). What *χάρις*, which Miss DARKOW translates 'charm', is to one may not be *χάρις* to another. Another test, that of *καθαρότης*, comes to naught by reason of Lysias' *ethopoia*, as we have just seen. This is quite in line with Professor Sanders' contention as to the occasional use of *ἄντες* with the future in Plato (A. J. P. XXXVII 42-61). Grammatical propriety is deliberately sacrificed to dramatic propriety. The man in the street is made to speak his own language. He says not 'tisn't' but 'tain't' and, in the eyes of the purist, Anstey's Tinted Venus becomes a tainted Venus, and the *χάρις* is lost. One recalls Bekker's famous characteristic of Cobet's Homeric criticism: 'Die seele seiner kritik ist nun einmal purismus, straffzügeliger, scheuklapseliger purismus.'—Hom. Blätter II 54. In his critical introduction to his ed. of Lysias Cobet is on safer ground. The sleuth-hounds of grammar and diction have nosed out many such things in Xenophon, and who has not yielded to the temptation in the region of *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*? (A. J. P. XXVII 485.)

But, though I am painfully aware of the physical limitations (A. J. P. XXXVII 232) that bar my serious pursuance of the subject, Lysias is to me a name to conjure with, and I hope I shall be pardoned for recalling the part the son of Kephalos has played in my life—for my living has also been my life, as it is with all real teachers of Greek. Yes—the name itself has interested me, and some years ago, forgetting my favourite quotation 'non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo convenit', I set up a mock defence of Teichmüller's identification of the Dionysodorus of Plato's Euthydemus with Lysias. Lysias, I said, is evidently the short for Lysanias, the name of his grandfather, and I propounded the equation *Λυσανίας*=*Λυαῖος*=*Διόνυσος*—a winged word which was promptly hawked at by a mousing owl of a German reviewer.¹ My first acquaintance with Lysias goes back to 1850, when I bought out of my scant allowance a copy of the Berlin ed. of the Attic orators, to find alas! as I went on in my studies that I had been swindled by somebody. A leaf of the *Παναθηναϊκός* of Isokrates had taken the place of a leaf of the *Περὶ παραπροσθείας* of Demosthenes. This is no solitary experience in the case of German editions, and I have occasionally registered a complaint (e. g. A. J. P. VIII 119). The mention of those Berlin days calls up the image of Johannes Franz (*Φραντσίκλης*) who admitted me to his Schola Graeca and gave me the name *Χρυσοβραχίων*. He too is a Lysianic reminisc-

¹ A. J. P. XXXV 364.

cence, for he edited Lysias in the year in which I was born. For years my favourite edition was the pretty pocket-edition by Westermann, which I proceeded to disfigure by marginal and other notes. It perished, to my sorrow, in the flood of water turned upon my library at the time of the Johns Hopkins fire. The scholar to whom I owe my first introduction to Lysias was Rauchenstein, the same who helped me in my first studies of Pindar. It may seem strange to some that the same man should have been an enthusiastic student of two authors so diverse as Lysias and Pindar (A. J. P. XXIV 108), but such a one has never considered the processes of wine-taster and tea-taster. Somewhere in the 'to-hu bo-hu' of my MSS there is a Greek exercise-book, based on Lysias, a safer model than Xenophon. Fifty years ago when a local Sir Oracle said to me that his test of Greek scholarship was a mastery of Pindar and Athenaeus, I ventured to remark that my test was an honest enjoyment of Lysias. So much of our enjoyment is factitious. In a series of studies entitled 'On the Steps of the Bema' I made a large place for Lysias, and illustrated the chapter 'Anarchy *plus* a street constable' (a Carlylese title) by the Third Oration. In those early days there was no American edition of Lysias and when at last one appeared, I wrote to the Nation an angry protest against the untimely birth, a protest which led to a correspondence with Mr. Garrison and subsequent work for our leading critical journal, as I have recorded in the Jubilee Number (July 8, 1915). There are other American editions in one of which there is or was a misleading note on the memorable asyndeton at the end of Or. XII. Of Morgan's excellent edition I have said something but not enough (A. J. P. XVI 396). One of the few emendations that I proposed he accepted (VII 14), but alas! I found afterwards that I had been anticipated, and a like fate befell another emendation by which I got rid of the impossible *ἀλεύσεοθαι* (XXII 11). See A. J. P. III 228. Professor Adams has had his meed of praise and thanks from all American lovers of Lysias. His edition is an admirable Praeparatio Rhetorica for the study of the Greek orators. In the years of my Olympiad in which the Attic orators formed the centre about which our studies revolved, Lysias was a conspicuous figure. The general scheme was suggested by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who had rashly maintained that in certain spheres it would be hard to distinguish between Lysias and Demosthenes (A. J. P. XXV 357). In the private orations the subjects minimize differences but even there the differences between the orators can be brought to the consciousness of the student by methods, some of which were unknown to the ancient critics. The very passages cited by Dionysius, *De admiranda* vi, p. 985, are wide apart, and comparative studies of orations by different orators in handling like themes formed a

good *ἀλυδῆθρα* for the young horsemen and the old hobby-rider. I do not repent me of the exercises imposed on the students of style, and a noteworthy result was the dissertation of Kirk, which deals with the private orations of Demosthenes and which has found favour in the eyes of those who know (A. J. P. XVII 391; XIX 234). One Seminary exercise consisted of a comparison between Lysias III, already referred to, and Demosthenes LIV, much admired by most students of Demosthenes, but vilipended or rather vilified by Bruns (A. J. P. XXV 356 fn.), cocksurest of the cocksure, who made the fatal slip of calling it *ὑπέρ Κόρωνος* instead of *κατὰ Κόρωνος*, a parallel to the intelligent juryman, who was puzzled by the recurring words 'plaintiff' and 'defendant'. The dissertation of Devries on the Ethopoia of Lysias belongs to the early days of the seminary and Holmes's Index to Lysias projected on a plan, which seemed to preclude the mistakes made in so many indexes, is due to the same environment. In this Index, as Miss DARKOW remarks, Holmes has included the *'Ερωτικός* of the Phaedrus. Vahlen's advocacy of Lysianic authorship stemmed the tide which had been running the other way, but Miss DARKOW thinks that Weinstock has opened the channel again, and made Plato responsible for the speech. Old Gorgias called Plato a new Archilochos, but to tell the truth, it seems hardly fair even for an Archilochos to create a *pastiche* (A. J. P. XXXV 231) and treat it as if it were the genuine work of the author ridiculed (A. J. P. XXVI 243). But the Zeus of Greek literature was capable of sophistic proceedings in his dealings with the sophists.

When the wielders of Thor's hammer, foretold of Heinrich Heine descendant of the prophets of old, had made some progress in destroying the temples of Christ, the son of an un-German god, there was some discussion among the followers of an un-German creed as to the course to be pursued after the war, whether to restore what used to be called in pseudo-classic style the sacred fanes that had been demolished or to let them remain to be a perpetual reminder of the ruin that had been wrought. It is an old problem, a problem which the Greeks had solved in their way. But what has called forth this *Brief Mention* is not the historical parallel but the impressive lesson as to the hopelessness of literary fame—a theme on which Bagehot and Stapfer and many others have enlarged. It is then not the case of the Cathedral of Reims but the case of Isokrates that I have in mind. If there ever was an elaborate piece of literary work it is the Panegyricus of Isokrates and yet a certain champion of Hellenism, who had taken all Greekdom for his province has actually reported

the action of the Greeks as recorded somewhere by somebody. I am going to be as vague as he was and content myself with transcribing Isok. Panegyr. 156: διὸ καὶ τὸς Ἰωνας ἄξιον ἐπαινεῖν ὅτι τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων ἵερῶν ἐπηράσαντ' εἴ τινες κινήσουσαν ἡ πάλιν εἰς τάρχαια καταστῆσαι βουληθεῖεν, οὐκ ἀποροῦντες, πόθεν ἐπισκενάσωσιν, ἀλλ' ἵν' ὑπόμνημα τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις γῆ τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀσεβείας, καὶ μηδεὶς πιστεύῃ τοῖς τοιαυτάντοις εἰς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔξαμαρτεῖν τολμῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ φυλάττωνται καὶ δεδιώσιν, ὅρωντες αὐτοὺς οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασι πολεμήσαντας. However as the Germans resent the title of 'barbarians' so freely bestowed on them, they might find some consolation in applying to the strategy of the Allies Dem. 4. 40: οὐδὲν δ' ἀπολείπετε, ὥσπερ οἱ βάρβαροι πυκτεύουσιν, οὐτω πολεμεῖν Φιλίππων, καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνων ὁ πληγεὶς δεῖ τῆς πληγῆς ἔχεται, κλεῖστρον πατάξεις, ἐκείσεις εἰσὶν αἱ χεῖρες, κτέ.

Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit. In the Corrigenda of this number (p. 462), Professor Gildersleeve refers to Jebb's misquotation of the famous line of Goldsmith's epitaph. It may be interesting to note that Jebb was not the first sinner. Dean Stanley was guilty of the same offence, and, if I mistake not, it was he that led Jebb astray. In the fifth edition of the Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey, an edition which 'is printed from the copy left by the Dean at his death, and containing his final corrections and additions,' there still appears the following (p. 279): 'But the whole inscription shows the supreme position which Goldsmith occupied in English literature; and one expression, at least, has passed from it into the proverbial Latin of mankind—*Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.' To this passage is appended the following note: '*Nullum scribendi genus quod tetigit non ornavit.* (Epitaph.)' Compare with this the words of Jebb, Essays and Addresses, p. 503: "Goldsmith," he said, "was a man who, whatever he wrote, always did it better than any other man could do"—a judgment which stands in the Latin of his famous epitaph on Goldsmith as *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*, "he touched nothing which he did not adorn." Jebb was too good a scholar to have written *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*, unless he had had the above passage of the Memorials before him and had really believed the line to be part of the epitaph.

If G. Birbeck Hill (Boswell's Life of Johnson, vol. iii, p. 82, footnote 3) is to be trusted, Dean Stanley originally perpetrated the following note on his misquotation: 'Professor Conington calls my attention to the fact that, if this were a genuine classical expression, it would be *ornaret*. The slight

mistake proves that it is Johnson's own.' The first edition of Dean Stanley's work is not accessible to me. In the second edition, the author tried to rectify his blunder by the substitution of the footnote cited above, and this footnote was retained in subsequent editions. But the attempt was only partially successful. To say nothing of the new inaccuracy of citation—the words *scribendi genus* ought to be enclosed in brackets to show that they do not actually appear in the epitaph—the author persisted in making the epitaph responsible for the origin of a proverbial expression the Latinity of which is doubtful and is a perversion of that of the original.

The original seems to have emanated from the pen of Boswell, the biographer of Dr. Johnson. In his account of the year 1763, Boswell gives a sketch of Goldsmith in which occurs the following remark: 'No man had the art of displaying with more advantage as a writer, whatever literary acquisitions he made. "*Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit.*"' To this remark, the author appends the footnote: "See his Epitaph in Westminster Abbey, written by Dr. Johnson." It seems likely that Dean Stanley had this passage in mind, but that he quoted from memory, with the resultant unhappy transposition of the words *quod* and *tetigit*.

Though Boswell, to warrant his own estimate of Goldsmith, refers specifically to the epitaph, there can be little doubt that he was but giving Latin expression to a favorite dictum of Johnson's. Cradock, in his Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs, vol. iv, p. 286, tells us that 'Johnson (when Goldsmith was absent), would frequently say, "Why, sir, whatever that man touches he adorns."'. This harmonizes with another statement of his, which has been used by Hill, l. c., to show that Johnson was merely repeating himself in his epitaph on Goldsmith. The statement is this (Memoirs, vol. I, 231): 'When a bookseller ventured to say something rather slightingly of Dr. Goldsmith, Johnson retorted:—"Sir, Goldsmith never touches any subject but he adorns it."'

A word or two remain to be said with regard to the dictionaries of quotations. At least three of the most widely used works of this kind cite the line of the epitaph, *nullum quod tetigit non ornavit*, to which is added the translation, 'He touched nothing that he did not adorn.' There is double ground for dissatisfaction with this. The Latin is not quotable, and the translation does not fit the citation. The Latin, as has been shown, is an adaptation by Johnson of his own dictum to the needs of his epitaph on Goldsmith. The English, it will be noticed, is a translation of Boswell's adaptation of the dictum to his own particular requirements. The obvious remedy would be to do away with the line of the epitaph in the cyclopedias of quotations and to insert in its place the

version of Boswell, which would have the triple merit of being eminently quotable, of removing the present incongruity between the Latin text and the English translation, and of eliminating, in a large measure, the danger of misquotation.¹

C. W. E. MILLER.

¹ The timeliness of the above remarks is apparent from a very recent misquotation, to which Professor Mustard has just called my attention: 'And whether he <Dr. Mackail> is explaining the *Pervigilium Veneris*, translating Virgil or Homer, or imaginatively describing Virgil's outlook on his native land, it may justly be said of him, *Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.' (Proceedings of the Classical Association, Jan. 1917, Vol. XIV, p. 103.)

CORRIGENDA.

P. 223, l. 18. Schikaneder wrote 'Führt *Liebe ihn* zur Pflicht'.—H. C. G. B. It was impossible at the time to verify my quotation and a lapse of memory after sixty-five years is pardonable—perhaps. As time goes on, I take less and less comfort from other people's blunders. Still my slip is venial when one recalls Jebb's misquotation of the famous epitaph of Johnson on Goldsmith which appears, and that in an essay on Johnson, *Essays and Addresses* p. 503, where 'nullum (sc. genus) quod tetigit, non ornavit' appears as 'nihil tetigit quod non ornavit' (ornaret?)—following carelessly and ungrammatically the familiar translation, 'touched nothing that he did not adorn'.

P. 227, l. 3 from bottom. Before 'of this sacrilegious encroachment' insert 'in specimens'.

P. 339, l. 28. Professor Hutton is not responsible for the identification of the Southern cause in the Civil War with that of Prussian Junkerdom. The pellet was aimed at the Northern press and its file-leader, the *New York Times*, and I regret that it hit an innocent bystander, who has naturally entered a protest.

B. L. G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

Beardslee (John Walter). Use of ΦΤΣΙΣ in fifth century Greek literature. *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1917. 75 c.

Bright (Ja. Wilson). An Anglo-Saxon reader; with notes, a complete glossary, a chapter on versification and an outline of Anglo-Saxon grammar. 4th ed. New York, *Holt*. 79 + 385 pp., 12°, \$1.75 net.

British School at Athens, (The) Annual. No. 21. Sessions 1914-1915, 1915-1916. Ryl. 8°, 10 x 64. *Macmillan*, 1917. 21s. net.

Byrne (Maria J.) Prolegomena to an edition of the works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius. 9 x 6, 110 pp. *Milford*, 1917. 5s. 6d. net.

Carroll (John S.) In Patria: an exposition of Dante's *Paradiso*. 8°, 579 pp. *Hodder & S.*, 1917. 10s. 6d. net.

Caesar (Caius Julius). The Gallic war; with an English tr. by H. J. Edwards. New York, *Putnam*. 22 + 619 pp., 16°. (Loeb Classical Lib.) \$1.50 net; leather, \$2 net.

D'Alton (J. F.) Horace and his age: a study in historical background. Cr. 8°, 308 pp. *Longmans*, 1917. 6s. net.

Dio's Roman history; with an English tr. by Earnest Cary. On the basis of the version of Herb. Baldwin Foster. In 9v. V. 5. New York, *Putnam*. 525 pp., 16°. (Loeb Classical Lib.) \$1.50 net.

Dutton (Emily Helen). Studies in Greek prepositional phrases. Menasha, Wis., *G. Banta*, 1916. 9 + 211 pp., 8°, \$1.50 net.

Erasmus. The Complaint of Peace. Tr. from the Latin of Erasmus, A. D. 1559. Ed. by Alexander Grieve. Cr. 8°, 125 pp. *Headley*, 1917. 2s. 6d. net.

Frazer (J. G.) Studies in Greek scenery, legend and history. Selected from his commentary on Pausanias' "Description of Greece". Cr. 8°, 429 pp. *Macmillan*, 1917. 5s. net.

Gawayne (Sir) and the Green Knight; re-edited from Cotton MS. by R. Morris. New York, *G. E. Stechert* (n. d.). Anastatic reprint. 20 + 124 pp., 8°, \$2.50 net.

Le Grand (Philippe E.) New Greek comedy; tr. by J. Loeb; with an introd. by J. Williams White. (Loeb Classical Lib.) 8°, xix, 547 pp. *Putnam*, 1917. \$4.50 net.

Lucan. De bello civili; liber viii; ed. by J. P. Postgate. 16°, x, cxii, 146, 16 pp. *Putnam*, 1917. \$1.

Palmer (Harold E.) The Scientific study and teaching of languages. 8°, 328 pp. *Harrop*, 1917. 10s. 6d. net.

Plotinus. The Ethical treatises: being the treatises of the first Ennead, w. Porphyry's Life of Plotinus and the Preller-Ritter Extracts. Tr. by Stephen MacKenna. In 4 vols. Fol. pp. 158. *P. Lee Warner*, 1917. 16s. net.

Rippmann (Wa.) *The sounds of spoken English. New version.* New York, *Dutton* (n. d.). 7 + 232 pp., 12°, \$1.25 net.

Seneca, *ad Lucilium epistulae morales*; with an English tr. by R. M. Gummere. In 3 v. V. I. New York, *Putnam*. (Loeb Classical Lib.) 15 + 467 pp., 16°, \$1.50 net.

Stidston (Russell Osborne). *The use of ye in the function of thou in Middle-English Literature*; rev. by Arth. G. Kennedy. *Leland Stanford Junior Univ.* 95 pp., 4°, pap., 75 c.

Westaway (K. M.) *The Original element in Plautus.* *Camb. Univ. Pr.*, 1917. Cr. 8°, 256 pp., 2s. 6d. net.

Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1916. Ed. by Stephen Gaselee. *J. Murray*, 1917. 8°, 115 pp., 2s. 6d. net.

FRENCH, ITALIAN, SPANISH.

Alighieri Dante, *La Divina Commedia con note a cura di Guido Vitali.* Livorno, *Paradiso*. 130 pp., con 3 tav. L. 1.20.

Barbieri (Federico). *Le rime e le commedie meneghine di Carlo Maria Maggi.* Milano. 136 pp. L. 3.

Bloch (Oscar). *Les Parlars des Vosges méridionales.* 10 fr.

Cejador y Frauca (Julio). *Historia de la lengua y literatura castellanas, comprendidos los autores hispano-americanos*, tomo VI (Epoca del siglo XVIII: 1701-1829), un vol. en Quarto, de 466 págs. Pes. 10.

Maspéro (Gaston). *Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne.* 15 fr.

— *Atlas linguistique des Vosges méridionales.* 22 fr. 50.

Pernot (Hubert). *Grammaire du grec moderne. Langue parlée.* 5 fr.

Prati (Angelico). *L'Italiano e il parlare della Valsugana*, 2a ediz. Roma, IX, 80. L. 2.

Ripert (Émile). *La Renaissance provençale 1800-1860.* 10 fr.

Sandalgian (Joseph). *Histoire documentaire de l'Arménie des âges du paganisme (1410 av.-305 apr. J. Chr.).* Roma, 2 vol., con tav. L. 16.

Tanquerey (F. J.) *L'Évolution du verbe anglo-français, XIII^e & XIV^e siècles.* 25 fr.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. Vol. XXI. No. 3. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1917.

Armstrong (Mary Emma). The Significance of Certain Colors in Roman Ritual. Johns Hopkins University Diss. Menasha, Wis., *George Banta Publishing Co.*, 1917.

Biblical Archaeology, The Society of. Proceedings. Vol. XXXIX. Part 5. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1917.

Census of Manufacturers, 1914. Abstract of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sam L. Rogers, Director. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1917. 65 c.

Cooper (Lane). Greek Genius and Its Influence. Select Essays and Extracts. Ed. with an Introduction. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1917. \$3.50.

D'Alton (J. F.) Horace and his Age. London, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1917. \$2 net.

Darkow (Angela C.) The Spurious Speeches in the Lysianic Corpus. Bryn Mawr Diss. Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1917.

Deutsch (M. E.) Suetonius and Caesar's German Campaign. T. A. P. A. Vol. XLVII, 1916.

Fox (W. Sherwood). Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology, Vol. XXXVIII 3.)

Garrison (Fielding H.) The Greek Cult of the Dead. Reprint from the Annals of Medical History.

Hatfield (J. T.) Lessing's Feeling for Classical Rhythms. Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Vol. XVI, No. 3. July, 1917.

Inter-America. Vol. I, Nos. 3 and 4, 1917. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*

Keidel (George C.) The Early Life of Professor Elliott. Washington, D. C., Privately printed, 1917.

Loeb Classical Library, The.

Caesar, The Gallic War, with an English translation by H. J. Edwards.

Dio's Roman History, by Earnest Cary. Vol. V.

Seneca ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, with an English translation by Richard M. Gummere. Vol. I.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Vol. I. School of Classical Studies, 1915-1916. Bergamo, *Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche*, 1917.

Murray (Augustus T.) Plot and Character of Greek Tragedy (T. A. P. Ass., XLVII, 1916).

Oldfather (W. A.) Studies in the History and Topography of Locris. I and II. Reprinted from the American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, Vol. XX (1916), No. 1 and 2.

— Addenda on Larymna and Cyrtone. Reprinted from the American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, Vol. XV (1916), No. 3.

— Review of Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores* and Zum Homerus Latinus. C. P. XI 2, April, 1916.

— The Fine Arts and the Classics. *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. VIII, No. 9, 1914.

— Roman Comedy. *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. VII. No. 28, 1914.

Reider (Joseph). *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila.* (A thesis of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning.) Philadelphia, 1916.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXV. Num. 1. Julio y Agosto de 1917.

Sedgefield (W. J.) *Selections from the Old English Bede with Text and Vocabulary . . . and a Skeleton Outline of Old English Accidence.* Manchester (England). *At the University Press*; London, New York, etc. *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1917. \$1.20 net.

Sepulcrum Ioannis Pascoli. *Carmen Francisci Sofia-Alessio Radi-
cenensis in Certamine Hoeufftiano praemio aureo donatum.* Accedunt X Carmina laudata. Amstelodami, *Apud Io. Mullerum*, MCMXVII.

Shakespeare. Yale Edition. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1917.

— *Much Ado About Nothing.* Ed. by Tucker Brooke. 50 c.

— *Romeo and Juliet.* Ed. by Willard Higley Durham. 50 c.

— *King Lear.* Ed. by William Phelps. 50 c.

— *Hamlet.* Ed. by Jack Randall Crawford. 50 c.

Shields (Emily Ledyard). *The Cult of Lesbos.* J. H. U. Diss. Menasha (Wis.), *Geo. Banta Pub. Co.*, 1917.

Stuart (Donald Clive). *The Origin of Greek Tragedy in the Light of Dramatic Technique.* Extracted from *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. XLVII, 1916.

Studies in Philology, Vol. XIV, Nos. 3 and 4. July and Oct., 1917. *University of N. C.*, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Sturtevant (E. H.). *Linguistic Change. An Introduction to the Historical Study of Language.* Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1917. \$1 net. Postage extra.

Trever (Albert Augustus). *A History of Greek Economic Thought.* (Univ. of Chicago Diss.) Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1916.

Tuttle (E. H.). *Notes on Romanic e and i.* (Reprinted from *Modern Philology*, Vol. XV, No. 3, 1917.)

Tyler (Lyon G.). *The South and Germany.* Reprint from *William and Mary College Quarterly*, July, 1917.

Value of the Classics. Princeton, N. J., *Princeton University Press*, 1917. \$1.50.

Wiener (Leo). *Contributions toward a History of Arabico-Gothic Culture.* Vol. I. New York, *The Neale Publishing Co.*, 1917. \$3.50 net.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVIII.

ABBOTT, FRANK FROST. The Pronunciation of a Final Consonant in a Latin Word-Group, 73-81
 Review of Ernout's Textes Latins Archaiques, 208-209
Achalme on German Science, 223
Adrianople, Classical remains in, 215
Aeschylus, Eum. 506 sqq., 161
 Persae 821-2, 455
ALLINSON, FRANCIS G. Review of Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology, 88-93
Antalcidas, 449
 Apophony and Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomato-poeias, 265-284
Apuleius, *Apologia*, Butler and Owen's (rev.), 204-205
De Magia, Marchesi's (rev.), 203-204
 Life of, 317-18
 Met. 81, 6-91, 8, 452
Arden Shakespeare (Am. ed.), 445
Ariston of Chios, 450
Aristophanes, Aves 1313 (em.), 232
 Religious Burlesque in, 176-185
Aristotelian Pneuma, 213
Arminius balladry, 449
 in Tacitus, 451
Aryan pitar- and Dravidian **pitar*, 315-316
Asclepiades Myrleanus, 452
Attic inscriptions, Johnson-Woodward, 108
 Orators, Political types in, 103
Ausonius, Byrne's (rev.), 320-321

BLAKE, FRANK R. Reduplication in Tagalog, 425-431
BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE. Some Cruces in Vedic Text, Grammar and Interpretation, 1-18
 Books Received, 122-124; 235-236; 347-348; 464-465

Boswell on Goldsmith, 461
Bouchier's Syria as a Roman Province, 321-322
Bréal, Michel, on Homer, 111-113
Breul's Goliard Songbook of the XIth C. (mentioned), 117
 Brief Mention, 110-115; 221-227; 333-342; 454-461
Burlesque, Religious, in Aristophanes and elsewhere, 176-185
Bywater, Ingram, Memorial of, 392-410

Caesar's Commentaries a re-publication, 329
CANTER, H. V. Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches, 125-151
CARNOY, ALBERT J. Apophony and Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomato-poeias, 265-284
Carpenter's Ethics of Euripides (mentioned), 340
Catullus, The Brescian Codex of, 98-99
 Headings of his poems, 220
Cicero, N. D. 2, 33, 83, 218
 Orator, Analysis of, 218
 Pro M. Tullio, 452
Ciris, Text of, 216
Coccchia's Lucio Apuleio (rev.), 317-318
Columbia University Shaksperian Studies, 93-66
Cook, ALBERT S. Petrarch and the Wine of Meroë, 312-314
 Cooper's, Lane, Concordance to Horace (rev.), 323-328
 Correspondence, Fay to Petersen, 228-232
 Corrigenda, 462
 Cyprian, Life of, 103

Darkow's Spurious Speeches of the Lysianic Corpus (mentioned), 455-459

Demosthenes 4, 40, 460
Olynthiacs and Philippics and the present war, 455

Denominative Verbs, 219

Dio Chrysostomus, Or. XI, 108

Diocles of Carystus, 449

Diodorus of Tarsus, 103

Delos, Architects and contractors at, 105

Dragoumis' Man of Athens (mentioned), 333

Dravidian *pitar-, Aryan pitar- and, 314-315

EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, 213-218; 447-451

EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Review of The Sanskrit Poems of Mayura, 435-441

English, Historical Present in, 341-342

Ernout's Textes Latins Archaiques (rev.), 208-209

Epicurean polemic against Providence, 453

Equos Troianus on the Roman Stage, 330

Errata, 342

Etruscan text on mummy cloth, 450

Euripides Hel. (emended), 102
Ion 1424, 101
I. A., Critical Notes on, 340
Archaism in, Manning's (mentioned), 339

Chorus in, Phoutrides' (mentioned), 341

Ethics of, Carpenter's (mentioned), 340

FAY, EDWIN W. Sobriquet and Stem, 83-87

Correspondence. Answer to Petersen, 228-232

Final Consonant in Latin, 73-81

Fowler's Virgil's Gathering of the Clans (rev.), 209-211

Fox, W. SHERWOOD. Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum, 304-311; 411-424

Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology (rev.), 88-93

FRENCH, J. C. Notice of Arden Shakespeare (Am. ed.), 445

FROTHINGHAM, ARTHUR L. Vediovis, A Volcanic God, 370-391

German Emperor and Greek, 455

GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L. An Oxford Scholar, 392-410

Paulus Silentarius, 23-72
See *Brief Mention*.

Glossary, St. Gall, 349-369

Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers, 118

Graffito, a misunderstood, 104

GRAVES, T. S. Review of Columbia University Shaksperian Studies, 93-96

Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum, 304-311; 411-424

Greek Law, Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in, 151-175; 285-303

Studies in Germany, 454-455

Greek words:

καστηρός, Et. of, 219;

ναύστης = νάύτης, 214;

τρέπεται, to cause one to change one's mind, 215;

τοιειν and πράττειν, 217;

προτράπειν, 452; σάτυροι = goat-demons, 218; τρυποι = ram-demons, 218.

Grotius, Note on his Mare liberum, 225

Gummere's Seneca (rev.), 446

Hannibal, Dialogue between Scipio Africanus and, 213

Hellespont, The name, 109

Herculanean Papyri, 219-220

Hercynian Forest really Silva Marciana, 330

Hermes, Report of, 213-218; 447-452

Hermes' lyre in Sophocles' 'Ixneval', 214

Herodotus, the physician, 214

Heron, Ptolemy and, 216

HEWITT, JOSEPH WILLIAM. Religious Burlesque in Aristophanes and elsewhere, 176-185

Hexameter, Penthemimeral caesura in, 215

Hippias in Xenophon and in Plato, 219

Hippocrates de arte not by Protagoras, 448

Hippolytus of Rome, Papyrus fragments of, 100

Historical Present in English, 341-342

Homer, Bréal on, 111-113

Homeric Poems, Disposition of Spoil in, 186-195

Homeric Word Rhythm, 106

Horace, Concordance to, Lane Cooper's (rev.), 323-328
a convert, 220
Ode I, 34, 448
Sat. I, 1, 61 (em.), 330
Second Book classified, 214

Sermones I, 10, 44, 194-199

Housman's *Manilius* (rev.), 206-207

HUMPHREYS, MILTON W. Review of Winter's *Nicolaus Steno*, 201-203

Hutton's *Thucydides and History* (mentioned), 338

HYDE, WALTER WOODBURN. Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in Greek Law, 151-175; 285-303
'Τροθῆκαι literature, 451

Isocrates 4, 156, 460
13, 12, 217

Jackson's Memorial of Ingram Bywater, 392-410

Julia Domna, 103

Justinus, Pompeius Trogus and, 19-41

Juvenal, VI and IV; Analysis of, 106
VII, 134, 220

Keller's Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin writers (mentioned), 118

KNAPP, CHARLES. Molle atque facetum, 194-199

Laberius, A new verse of, 214

Latin, Vulgar, Apophony and Rhyme Words in, 265-284

Latin: Historical Infinitive, 100
Poetical Inscriptions, 449
Pronunciation of a Final Consonant, 73-81
Synizesis in, 218

Latin words: *Adipalis*, 217; *Antium*, 218; *in potestatēm fuisse*, 331; *stlattaria*, 220; *urbes, urbis* in *Vergil*, 220.

Lifeless Things and Animals, Prosecution of in Greek Law, 151-175; 285-303

LINDSAY, W. M. The St. Gall Glossary, 349-369

LITCHFIELD, H. W. Review of Ernout's *Lucrèce, De la Nature*, livre quatrième, 322-323

Livy's Direct Speeches, Rhetorical Elements in, 125-151
accuracy vindicated, 329
Epitome of, 451

Lucian, Peripatetic source of his *τερπὶ τοῦ μὴ ἀρδλως ποτεῖνεις διαβολῆς*, 107

Lucian's *Phalaridea*, 450

Lucretius, Ernout's (rev.), 322-323

Lysianic Corpus, Darkow's Spurious Speeches of the (mentioned), 455-459

MAGOFFIN, R. V. D. Review of Cuq, *Locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale*, 96-98
Dottin, *Les anciens peuples de l'Europe*, 443-445
Report of *Revue de Philologie*, 100-109; 329-330

Marchesi's *Apuleius de Magia* (rev.), 203-204

Marcus' *εἰς ταῦτα*, Epigram in, 217

Martial 5, 77 and 9, 95, 220

Mayūra, Sanskrit Poems of, 435-441

Menander's Epitreponetes, New Fragments of, 213
Perikeiromene, 214

Meroë, The Wine of, Petrarch and, 312-314

Meteorology in antiquity, 447

MILLER, C. W. E. *Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit*, 460-462
Report of *Rheinische Museum*, 106-109

Review of Lane Cooper's Concordance to Horace, 323-328

Molle atque facetum, 194-199

Muretus and the Lusitania, 334

MURRAY, A. T. Disposition of Spoil in Homeric Poems, 186-193

MUSTARD, W. P. Brief Mention of Breul's *Goliard Songbook*, 117
Gnesotto's *Francisci Barbari De Re Uxorii*, 342

Keller, Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers, 118

Stampini's Studi, 116
 Thayer's Influence of Horace, 116
 Ussani's Satire di Orazio, 117
 Wessels' Mantuanus de Calamitatibus Temporum, 118
 Review of Gummere's Seneca, 446
 Walters' Classical Dictionary, 211-212

NICHOLS, EDWARD W. Review of Housman's Manilius, 206-207
 Nicopolis in Epirus, 329
 Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit, 400-462

Olympian Chronicle, 108
 Orthagorids of Sicyon, 330
 Oscana Inscription (Glans Saepinas), 331
 Ovid's Metamorphoses, when composed, 213

Paulus Silentarius, 42-72; 247
 Pausanias and the periegetic form of his work, 215
 Penthemimeral caesura, 215
 Persius V 165-166, 111
 Petronius, Critical Notes on, 102
 Petrarch's Secretum, 332
 and the wine of Meroe, 312-314
 Philodemus *repl. eboebelas* restored, 109
 Phoutrides' Chorus in Euripides (mentioned), 341
 Pindar, Quoted and slighted, 340
 P. 3, 52 (schol.), 217
 8, 48-55, 220
 9, 82-83 discussed, 335
 11, 55 (em.), 331
 I. 2, 8, 110
 Pisistratus' body-guard, 448
 Plataea, Topography of, 217
 Plato, Phaedrus and the Vindobonensis 54, 104
 Laws 960 c (em.), 104
 Rpb. 304 c (em.), 104
 Timaeus, Proclus' Commentary on, 105
 Plautus, Plot of the Epidicus of, 237-264
 Plebs, Origin of the, 452
 Pliny on the history of art, 329
 A lost work of, 217
 N. H. 35. 71, 164
 Plotinus, not an emanationist, 448
 Plutarch, Cim. 18 (em.), 482

POE, E. A. Puzzling passage (em.), 114
 Polybius, 6, 19, 2, 100
 Pompeius Trogus and Justinus, 19-41
 Preston's Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy, 328
 PROKOSCH, E. Slavic togo, 432-434
 Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in Greek Law, 151-175; 285-303
 Ptolemy and Heron, 216

Quadi, 217

Recent Publications, 119-121; 233-234; 347-348; 462-463

Reduplication in Tagalog, 425-431

Religious Burlesque in Aristophanes and elsewhere, 176-185

Reports: Hermes, 213-218; 447-452
 Revue de Philologie, 100-109; 329-330
 Rheinisches Museum, 106-109
 Rivista di Filologia, 218-221; 330-332; 452-453

Reviews: Byrne's Ausonius, 320-331
 Bouchier, Syria as a Roman Province, 320-321
 Cocchia, Romanzo e realtà nella vita e nell' attività di Lucio Apuleio, 317-318
 Cooper's Concordance to Horace, 323-328
 Cuq, Locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale, 96-98
 Dottin, Les anciens peuples de l'Europe, 443-445
 Ernout's Recueil de textes Latins Archaiques, 208-209
 Lucrèce I. 4, 322-323
 Fowler's Virgil's Gathering of the Clans, 209-211
 Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology (rev.), 88-93
 Gummere's Seneca, 446
 Housman's Manilius, 206-207
 Marchesi's Apuleius de Magia, 203-204
 Preston's Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy, 328
 Quackenbos' Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, 435-441
 Shaksperian Studies of Columbia University, 93-96

Stampini's *Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo*, 98-99
 Studi, 116
 Vespucci Reprints, 318-319
 Walters' Classical Dictionary, 211-212
 Wells' *Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, 441-443
 Winter's *Prodomus of Nicolaus Steno*, 201-203
 Revue de Philologie, Report of, 100-109; 330-332
 Rheinisches Museum, Report of, 106-109
 Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches, 125-151
 Rhodes, Founders of, 216
 Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomatopoeias, 265-284
 Rivista di Filologia, Report of, 218-221; 330-332; 447-452
 Roberts, Rhys, Patriotic Poetry in Greek and English (mentioned), 223
 Rome, Inhabited portions of Imperial, 93-96
 Roman Comedy, *Sermo Amatorius* in, 328
 St. Gall Glossary, The, 349-369
 Sanders, Henry N. Note on Aristophanes Av. 1313, 232
 Scipio Africanus and Hannibal, Dialogue between, 213
 Seleucus Nicator, Closing years of his reign, 221
 Sellasia, Topography of, 217
 Seneca, Critical Contributions to N. Q., 108
Epistulae Morales, Gummere's (rev.), 446
 Shaksperian Studies (rev.), 93-96
 SLAUGHTER, M. S. Review of Bouchier's *Syria as a Roman Province*, 321-322
 Fowler's *Virgil's Gathering of the Clans*, 209-211
 Slavic *togo*, 432-434
 SMITH, KIRBY FLOWER. Report of Rivista di Filologia, 218-221; 230-232; 452-453
 Reviews: Butler and Owen's *Apulei Apologia*, 204-205
 Byrne's *Ausonius*, 320-321
 Coccchia's *Lucio Apuleio*, 317-318
 Marchesi's *Apuleius de Magia*, 203-204
 Preston's *Sermo Amatorius* in Roman Comedy, 328
 Vespucci Reprints, 318-319
 Sobriquet and Stem, 82-87
 Sophocles 'Ix^{er}ovat', Hermes' Lyre in, 214
 Recurrent Words in, 337
 Trach, 554
 Speeches, Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct, 125-151
 Spoil in Homeric Poems, Disposition of, 188-193
 Stampini's *Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo* (rev.), 98-99; Studi di letteratura e filologia latina (mentioned), 116
 Stanley's, Dean, misquotation of Johnson on Goldsmith, 461-462
 Steadman's *Historical Present in English* (mentioned), 342
 STEELE, R. B. Pompeius Trogus and Justinus, 19-41
 Stem, Sobriquet and, 82-87
 Syria as a Roman Province, 321-322
 Tacitus, Ann. II, 88, 216
 TATLOCK, JOHN S. P. Review of Wells' *Manual of the Writings in the Middle English*, 441-443
 Thayer's *Influence of Horace upon the Chief English Poets of the Nineteenth Century* (mentioned), 116
 Terence, Andria, 102
 Thomson's *Studies in the Odyssey* (mentioned), 222, 333
 Tibullus, Brescian Codex of, 98-99
 Timotheus, The Persians of, 214
 Thucydides and History, Hutton's (mentioned), 338
 Speeches in, 259
toga, Slavic, 432-434
 TURTLE, EDWIN H. Aryan *pitar-* and Dravidian **pitar-*, 315-316
 ULLMAN, B. L. Review of Stampini's *Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo*, 98-99
 Ussani's *Satire di Orazio* (mentioned), 117
 Valla, Laurentius, Rutilius Namatianus and, 219

Varro M. T.,	108	Wells' Manual of the Writ-
on the hexameter,	452	ings in Middle English
Vedic Cruces,	1-18	(rev.), 441-443
Vediovis, the Volcanic God,		Wessels' Mantuanus de Cala-
	370-391	mitatibus Temporum
Vespucci Reprints,	318-319	(mentioned), 118
Virgil, Bucolics,	103	WHEELER, ARTHUR LESLIE.
Ecl. 4, 62 (discussed),	452	The Plot of the Epidicus,
Gathering of the Clans		237-264
(Aen. VII, 601-817),	209-211	Winter's Prodromus of Nico-
Vitellius, Praetorians of,	100	laus Steno (rev.), 201-203
Walters' Classical Dictionary		Xenophon, Mem. IV 4, 219
(rev.),	211-212	Zomino, 453

THIS VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE